National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

MARLOVIAN TRAGEDY: THE PLAY OF DILATION

BY

TRONI Y. GRANDE ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 1992

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-73014-5

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Troni Y. Grande

TITLE OF THESIS: Marlovian Tragedy: The Play of Dilation

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1992

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Troni Grande

#108, 10818-81 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T6E 1Y4

April, 1992

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled MARLOVIAN TRAGEDY: THE PLAY OF DILATION submitted by TRONI Y. GRANDE in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

Linda Woodbridge
Linda Woodbridge (supervisor)

Patricia Demers
Patricia Demers

Jonathan Hart
Jonathan Hart

Nicole Mallet
Nicole E. Mallet

Sara M. Deats
Sara M. Deats

December 13, 1991

DEDICATION

IN MEMORIAM

MARY-JANE TITELEY REGNAULT

Because she lives

A Portion of the Loveliness
Which now she makes more lovely

ABSTRACT

All Marlovian plays end in the conventionally tragic way, with death. Each of Marlowe's plays, as well as Hero and Leander, engages the reader formally (that is, through emplotment as well as through content) by evoking our expectations of a tragic end only to defer them. When the highly literate Marlowe evokes a conventional tragic ending, we can often understand it as the echoic effect of an authoritative, originating source against which he struggles to create his own "translation." Marlowe encourages his readers not only to measure his works against their authoritative "originals," but also to establish patterns of coherence among his works: in a given work he often inscribes, like a signature, a self-reflexive allusion to a previous work, or to a favoured classical image that can be traced throughout his oeuvre. The first chapter uses Hero and Leander as a test-case to introduce the dual focus on dilation both as a formal technique and as an effect on the reader. Each subsequent chapter traces, through an appropriate play or pair of plays, a different aspect of Marlovian dilation. Tamburlaine exhibits a specifically generic dilation by setting the conventions of heroic romance against those of de casibus tragedy. Dido and Dr. Faustus present the protagonists' dalliance as a linguistic dilation, a vernacular evasion of the Latin law of tragedy. Edward II shows the tragic

hero's desire for a temporal dilation, set against contracting images of Time the Destroyer. In The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, Marlowe's characteristic deferral of the tragic end involves what we may call a ritual dilation, which implicates us in the tragic process of scapegoating. Marlovian tragedy dilates the moment of pleasure for the tragic protagonist and the reader, thus forestalling the "law" of tragedy that dictates the overreacher's fall. The image of Zeus holding back the horses of the night encapsulates Marlowe's own dilatory technique in each of his major works. This study of Marlowe's transformations of tragic narrative aims to elucidate his characteristic moral ambiguity and to illuminate his distinctive tragic signature throughout his entire canon.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A generous two-year Doctoral Fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada greatly facilitated the writing of this thesis. I also wish to thank the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Alberta for additional scholarship money, and for a travel bursary which advanced my thesis preparation by allowing me to present a conference paper on Dido and Hamlet at the Pacific Northwest Renaissance Conference in Vancouver in March, 1991.

I have been extremely fortunate in my choice of supervisor: the power of Linda Woodbridge's positive thinking, expert knowledge, and very humane flexibility will serve as a cheering example of professionalism in my future endeavours. Also inspirational were my other departmental committee members: Patricia Demers, for achieving with such grace her own standards of excellence; and Jonathan Hart, for instilling confidence by generously treating me as a colleague and offering many aids to research. I am also grateful for the incisive commentary and continuing encouragement of Robert R. Wilson, an important member of my constructed audience, whose course in Renaissance narrative first sparked my interest in Marlowe's playful self-consciousness and introduced me to the notion of dilation. Rick Bowers, Jean MacIntyre, Jim Forrest, and Don Perkins offered helpful and stimulating suggestions at various points during my research and writing of this thesis. The unforgettable members of a first-year course (English 100) who studied Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* with me in Fall, 1990, gave in enthusiasm and insight as much as they received in instruction.

For sustaining emotional support, I am deeply grateful to David Gay and Anne Smith; and to Chris Wiesenthal, who never doubted the crossing of the Rubicon. My mother Ruth taught me about giving, for she knew just when to encourage and extol, and when to wait in silence. My father Erich offered the inspiration of his own experience as well as instrumental help in achieving my goals. For the privilege of celebration and commiseration, I thank all my Grande relatives: my supportive brothers Rene and Conrad, the extended family I have found in Laurie and the ever-miraculous Allison and Matthew, as well as Kim Olsvik Keyowski. I benefited very much from the emotional and financial support of Irene and Gilbert L. Sherbert, and from the enthusiasm of the other members of their family. Rhonda Gora with humour and compassion helped me envision and achieve what I have come to know as the deliverance of underkin. My deepest debt is to Garry Sherbert, who showed an inimical balance of the claims of head and heart, and who loved me for where I was but dared me to be more: his influence lines these pages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER

PROLOGUE: Marlowe and the Ends of Tragedy 1

ACT I. "This unfinished Tragedy": Dilation in Hero and Leander 22

ACT II. "Daring God out of heaven": Tamburlaine's Fortunate Fall 64

ACT III. "Striving Tongues": The Play of Linguistic Authority in Dido and Dr. Faustus 127

ACT IV. "Stand still you watches of the element": Shortening the Time in Edward II 211

ACT V. "To Save the Ruin of a Multitude": The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris 276

WORKS CITED 325

PROLOGUE

Marlowe and the Ends of Tragedy

A generic study that would account for Marlowe's transformations of tragic structure is long overdue.[1] The briefest survey of Marlowe's dramatic oeuvre indicates the insistent formal presence of tragedy: all of Marlowe's plays end in the conventionally tragic way, with death.[2] And yet a corresponding survey of Marlowe criticism indicates the virtual absence of genre studies that would demonstrate the importance of Marlowe's tragic endings. Those critics who have examined the implications of Marlowe's tendency towards tragedy have confined themselves to imagistic, rhetorical, or philosophical patterns in Marlowe's plays.[3] Yet Marlowe's plays reveal their affinities with tragedy not just because they deal, thematically, with the figure of the ironic overreacher who is destined to plunge into suffering and evil. Each of Marlowe's plays--and indeed, Hero and Leander as well--engages the reader formally (that is, through emplotment as well as through content) by evoking our expectations of a tragic end only to defer them. This study fills a critical need by exploring Marlowe's various "dilations" of tragedy throughout his entire corpus.[4]

Placing Marlowe's works within the generic context that they themselves evoke will allow us to study the important Renaissance relationship between what T. S. Eliot calls "tradition and the individual talent" ("Tradition" 4).[5] The tracing of generic conventions in a literary work provides one way of exploring the transmission of literary authority, between writers, and in turn from writer to reader. Given that a work sets up a generic code or even "law of genre" which it then often reinterprets (that is, decodes in a new way), a genre critic might well regard works in the light of "translations."[6] Trained to think of literary creation in precisely these terms--as translation of authoritative classics--Renaissance writers in fact testify to their conscientiousness (if not to their "anxiety") about the informing influences of their own, primarily classical and biblical, tradition. When the highly literate Marlowe evokes a conventional tragic ending, we can therefore often understand it as the echoic effect of an authoritative, originating source against which he struggles to create his own "translation."

Marlowe's plays reveal another, equally fascinating, echoic effect that emerges in a study of his generic transformations. As Thomas McAlindon points out, "patterns of verbal iteration and variation are an important feature of Marlowe's art" (English Renaissance Tragedy 103). Marlowe encourages his readers not only to measure his works against their authoritative "originals," but also to establish patterns of coherence among his works, for in a given work he often inscribes, like a signature, a self-reflexive allusion to a previous work, or to a favoured classical image that can be traced throughout his oeuvre. Harry Levin's The Overreacher remains a classic of Marlowe criticism precisely because it traces a central unifying image, which resonates with significance for Marlowe himself, throughout all of Marlowe's works.[7] Levin argues that "Marlovian tragedy in stark outline" is represented by the figure of the overreacher (24), whose fall through pride is in turn mirrored in the recurring figures Icarus and Phaeton (112).[8] Levin begins the important work of outlining a typology of Marlovian tragedy. Icarus and Phaeton (who reach towards the sun's power) and Ganymede (who, as the gods' cup-bearer, enjoys divine power) surface so often in Marlowe's canon that they become defining mythical features of his work. But there is another recurring image that has not received critical attention: the image of Zeus holding back the horses of the night, doubling a night of pleasure with his beloved and preventing the sober daylight realities of duty, order, and reason. In my study of Marlowe's transformations of the conventional end of tragedy, this image functions as a mise en abyme, a miniature embedded narrative, that encapsulates Marlowe's own dilatory technique in each of his plays, as indeed in his erotic epyllion. Marlowe, like Zeus, dilates the moment of "pleasure" for his tragic protagonists (as well as for his reader), thus forestalling the "law" of tragedy that dictates the fall of his proud, aspiring overreachers.

All of Marlowe's plays self-reflexively foreground their connection to the mainstream tragedy in the Renaissance: de casibus tragedy, an essentially prose kind which originates in Boccaccio's De casibus virorum illustrium and passes into England through Lydgate's The Fall of Princes. As shown by the popular Renaissance compendium of the genre, the collective work A Mirror for Magistrates, de casibus tragedy offers moral lessons about the dire consequences of pride and ambition, through recounting (as its critical designation implies) the falls of those in high places. In fact, the chief defining feature of de casibus tragedy is its recurring narrative structure of rise-and-fall, a structure which is inherently moralized. Marlowe's plays, ending in a fall which can also be seen as a retribution for sin, variously suggest links to this most conventional Renaissance tragic kind. In Tamburlaine, for example, the falls of ambitious princes, combined with the recurring word "mirror," evoke the de casibus or Mirror narrative background, against which Tamburlaine's own dilated rise becomes even more bold and startling a variation. The Chorus in Dr. Faustus similarly challenges us to test Marlowe's play against the conventional Mirror tradition, for it announces Faustus's fall by quoting a line from the Mirror for Magistrates: "Cut is the branch that might have grown full straight" (Epilogue 20).[9]

Other Marlovian plays clearly emphasize the protagonist's fall through title-page inscriptions[10] or, even more importantly, textual indicators. Dido's famous fall hardly needs emphasis, since it has the status of a cultural fact for a Renaissance audience; but Marlowe nonetheless cites Virgil's original parting scene between Aeneas and Dido, and then ambiguously parodies Dido's death in the triple suicide at the end of his play. Indeed, as we trace the word throughout Marlowe's plays, "tragedy" comes to denote death, or the final "period" of one's life. Edward II confirms that Marlowe defines "tragedy" as life's (often violent) end, the nadir of the fall through ambition. As his assassin Lightborn at last enters the prison cell to murder him, Edward cries out, "These looks of thine can harbor nought but death; / I see my tragedy written in thy brows" (V.v.72-73). Queen Isabella, when she sees the imminence of both her fall and that of the proud Mortimer, likewise prophesies, "Now, Mortimer, begins our tragedy" (V.vi.23). Marlowe's dilation of the tragic end governs The Jew of Malta, too, as Machiavel might well alert us when he promises in Marlowe's Prologue "to present the tragedy of a Jew" (30). Finally, even the Guise in The Massacre at Paris, when initiating the bloody slaughter of the Huguenots, tells the Admiral's murderer, "play thy tragic part" (I.ii.28).

If he inscribes within his plays the Renaissance definition of tragedy as an untimely, violent end,[11] Marlowe also self-consciously dilates that end in each of his texts. Dilation, *amplificatio*, or *copia*, as it is variously known, is a common rhetorical and narrative technique in which Renaissance writers were trained to possess great proficiency: Erasmus's *De Copia*, along with numerous other Renaissance handbooks, teaches rhetorical "invention" in terms of the amplification of smaller units of discourse. As Patricia Parker has well argued, dilation includes for Renaissance writers both a spatial and a temporal dimension:

> The specifically rhetorical meaning of 'dilate'--the amplifying and prolonging of discourse--involves both an expansion and an opening up, the creation of more copious speech through the explication, or unfolding, or a brief or closed, hermetic 'sentence,' widening the space between its beginning and ending . . . .
>
> ("Dilation" 520)

What we might call Marlowe's "widening" of tragedy becomes more intelligible if we see it, in the rhetorical terms here outlined by Parker, as an extending (indeed a distending) of the tragic "sentence" described by *de* casibus rise-and-fall. Parker's illuminating deconstructive studies of "dilation" as delay trace "dilatio in its multiple contexts" ("Dilation" 520), by isolating the word or its cognates in Renaissance texts.[12] Although they admittedly do not use the word "dilation," Marlowe's works manifestly rely upon dilation as a narrative technique. Dilation allows Marlowe a measure of inventive resistance to the authoritative "sentences" which regulate literary discourse.

Marlowe's dilations of his tragic endings involve an essentially romantic (or heroic) impulse.[13] Indeed, as Parker has shown, dilation characterizes the mode of romance, which lingers or "wanders" on the threshold of a promised end rendered either as apocalyptic fulfillment or as catastrophe (Inescapable Romance 4). The episodes of "dalliance" in Marlovian tragedy often promise delights that suggest the wish-fulfillment dream of romance, in opposition to the ironic nightmare-vision of a world governed by Time the Destroyer. The Marlovian overreacher dreams of controlling the ultimate sign of human limitation, death, and of holding back the forces of mutability that make death such a heavy fact of human existence. In Marlowe's plays, dilation thus signifies a space of dalliance, wantonness, or release before the final judgment of tragedy comes to cut down the protagonist and mete out an orthodox retribution.

In Marlovian tragedy, protagonist and reader remain poised on the threshold before a symbolic microcosmic apocalypse. Marlowe's dilation of death, or postponement of closure, suggests a connection with the theological meaning of "dilation": the Church Fathers referred to life in this world as a postponement of the final "sentence" of judgment to be passed on every human being at the Apocalypse.

> Patristic writers speak of the period of deferred 'doom'--Apocalypse or Last Judgment--as a space of 'dilation' between Christ's First and Second Coming, a dilatio patriae (Alanus de Insulis) or delaying of history's final Recognition Scene which is also a renewed time of wandering or error (2 Timothy 4).
>
> (Parker, "Dilation" 524)

Marlowe gives his protagonists a night-space of undifferentiated wandering before their own personal apocalypse claims them. Just as St. Augustine, in Frank Kermode's formulation, "speaks of the terrors of the End as a figure for personal death" (25), so Marlowe, most explicitly in Dr. Faustus, shows the end of dilation as a terrifying apocalyptic catastrophe. Indeed, the often meteoric Marlovian hero usually dies in what seems a blazing conflagration; and Marlowe ends his plays with a bang, not a whimper.

Marlowe's reader experiences the suspension of this catastrophe as a kind of peripeteia, or reversal of the end. Kermode's study of closure in the novel shows that peripeteia as a narrative technique of reversing expectations corresponds, in rhetorical terms, to the technique of irony (18). Marlowe's ironic strategies of delaying yet ultimately fulfilling our expectations provide new Renaissance evidence to support Kermode's argument: our need to establish fictional closure corresponds to a deep-rooted (religious) need to build an apocalyptic frame around history, to ward off the forces of chaos, and yet "the interest of having our expectations falsified is obviously related to our wish to reach the discovery or recognition by an unexpected and instructive route" (18). Such is the pleasure afforded by Marlowe's tragic texts--they evoke our need for structure, specifically for a generic frame to contain the "chaos" of matter, yet they test our structural paradigms, challenging us to make sense of our own ends.[14]

Framing his oeuvre with the aid of genre criticism, I will examine Marlowe's strategic deferral of readerly expectations. Genre functions as a code of communication between writer and reader, in Northrop Frye's helpful formulation a "grammar of literary archetypes" (Anatomy 136), which allows us to "naturalize" or make sense of literary discourse. That the Renaissance, like the Middle

Ages, understood tragedy essentially as a plot or mythos, beginning in prosperity and ending in misery, becomes clear through a perusal of the extant literary criticism. The relation of Marlowe and his contemporaries, at least until Jonson, to connected notions of classical decorum is less important. A general review of English Renaissance drama forcefully suggests its habitual inattention to the unities: before the tragic end, most Renaissance plays involve much "mongrel" tragicomic play. But for all that, Renaissance tragedy has a moral aim, stressed repeatedly in the criticism as well as in dramatic practice. In dilating the end, Marlowe most significantly defers the moment of tragic judgment, offering his readers instead an ambiguous vision where good and evil often seem mixed, rather than divided.

A full-length study of Marlowe's transformations of tragic narrative, which takes the works on their own terms rather than setting them under the giant shadow of Shakespeare,[15] will thus yield fresh insights not just about Marlovian narrative technique but also about the ambiguity we associate with "this dark ironist" (Weil 20). As Joel Altman argues in his Tudor Play of Mind, the Renaissance training in dialectic gave impetus to the popularity of drama as a preferred medium of inquiry. And "Marlowe the questioner," as Danson calls him, chooses the inherently "dialogical" medium of drama to enact his questions. Marlowe's choice of the genre of tragedy is equally significant, for tragedy inscribes contrariety and chaos: as McAlindon shows, English Renaissance tragedy tends "to conceive of the tragic as a process of sudden, extreme change involving the clash and confusion of contraries," and the tragic hero is a creature of "impossible mixtures" ("Tamburlaine" 59). Several years ago, Carol Leventen Duane indicated the need for a full-scale study of Marlowe's ambiguity, arguing that "much of Marlowe's characteristic moral ambiguity may result from his deliberate, controlled, and masterly presentation and manipulation of multiple perspectives and divided responses" (51). Studying the interplay between Marlowe's evocation of the conventional end of tragedy and his various dilations of that end will provide a valuable means of exploring his moral ambiguity.[16]

In the chapters that follow, close readings of the plays balance my structuralist tendency to impose patterns on Marlowe's corpus. The first chapter uses Hero and Leander as an illuminating test-case to introduce our dual focus on dilation both as a formal technique and as an effect on the reader. As he dilates Musaeus's authoritative tragic ending, Marlowe creates a "translation" or imitation with an attitude not of veneration but of parody attached. Hero and Leander also reveals the intersection, crucial for Marlowe readers, between generic and authorial expectations. Subsequent chapters build on these introductory points, but each chapter traces, through an appropriate play or pair of plays, a different aspect of dilation. Tamburlaine exhibits a specifically generic dilation by setting the conventions of heroic romance against those of de casibus tragedy. Dido and Dr. Faustus present the protagonists' dalliance as a linguistic dilation, a vernacular evasion of the Latin law of tragedy. Edward II shows the tragic hero's desire for a temporal dilation, set against contracting images of Time the Destroyer. In The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris, Marlowe's characteristic deferral of the tragic end comes to involve what we may call a ritual dilation, which involves us in the tragic process of scapegoating. Both of these plays evoke the (apocalyptic) judgment of tragedy's final act, the ultimate choice between good and evil; yet at the same time they dilate this final act of separation, by showing the underlying lack of differentiation between opposites.

Roland Barthes argues that all reading involves a "struggle to name," an espace dilatoire between beginning and ending: "between question and answer there is a whole dilatory area whose emblem might be named 'reticence,' the rhetorical figure which interrupts the sentence, suspends it, turns it aside" (S/Z 75). The method of the following chapters aims at detailing this "dilatory area" in

Marlowe's preferred "sentence" of tragedy.

Yet, while I evoke the poststructuralist emphases on the reader and the text, my study aims as well at illuminating the author. For, while indulging in the "pleasure" of the text, we continue to "desire the author" (Barthes, Pleasure 27). The "death of the author" looms large in Marlowe studies. From Levin to Greenblatt, critics have read Marlowe's works in light of the writer's defiantly iconoclastic life and untimely, suspicious end.[17] Recent criticism moves beyond readings of Marlowe's works as straightforward expressions of the author's personality, realizing instead that the author is a construct: resurrecting "Marlowe" from his historical traces (including not only his works, but also Baines' libel and Kyd's defamatory portrait), we recognize that he, like his works, was fashioned within a "system of ennabling conventions which constitute and delimit the varieties of discourse" (Culler, Structuralist Poetics 30). But, even if understood as an "author-construct," Marlowe remains highly useful as a unifying principle that aids in the reading of his corpus.[18] Far from discarding the notion of "individual talent," this study of Marlowe's dilations of tragedy attempts to illuminate his distinctive tragic signature throughout his entire canon.

Notes

[1] Several critics have treated Marlowe's tragic features or "tragic vision," but the standard studies tend to ignore formal elements in favour of philosophical notions of tragedy or comparisons to the "essence" of Shakespeare's tragedies. See, for example, the studies by Barber, Bradbrook, Masinton, and McAlindon. While Cole, as well as Baker, Farnham, and Margeson outline the three-fold dramatic tradition--mystery play, morality play, and Senecan tragedy--out of which Marlowe wrote, no critic has fully explored Marlowe's manipulation of conventional tragic structure.

[2] See Theodore Spencer for evidence that death is a conventional feature of Elizabethan tragedy. Hardin Craig points out that the Elizabethan conception of death as the end of tragedy differs from the Aristotelian: "the Elizabethans seem to have believed that a tragedy must close with death, which becomes for them an inevitable end, a symbol of the final and the terrible. In their philosophy and their morals they set a greater value upon death than did the ancients" (11).

[3] See Levin's imagistic study of the Marlovian overreacher; Weil's rhetorical study of Marlowe's masterful irony; and Cole's more philosophical study of suffering and evil.

[4] My deliberately non-chronological study avoids drawing conclusions about Marlowe's "growth" or "evolution" as a dramatic artist. Indeed, we have no certain facts about the chronology of Marlowe's works: Tamburlaine (1590) is the only play known to have been published in Marlowe's lifetime. For speculations on the order in which Marlowe composed the plays, and for discussions of the Marlovian canon, see Bowers, Complete Works; Tucker Brooke, "Marlowe Canon"; Leech, Christopher Marlowe; and Ribner, Complete Plays. Most critics concur with Ribner that Marlowe's translations of Ovid and Lucan, as well as Dido (c. 1586), are his earliest compositions, followed in turn by Tamburlaine (c. 1587), The Jew of Malta (1588-92), and The Massacre at Paris (1589-92), with Edward II (1591-92) and Dr. Faustus (1592-93) vying for the honour of being considered Marlowe's final play. Hero and Leander is usually considered the last work in the Marlovian canon, left "unfinished" at the author's death in 1593.

[5] See Eliot's influential passage: "No poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation, is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead" (Eliot, "Tradition" 4). Dubrow cites these lines to underscore the importance of literary tradition in generic readings (Genre 43-44).

[6] On the "law of genre," see Derrida's treatment: "as soon as genre announces itself, one must respect a norm, one must not cross a line of demarcation, one must not risk impurity, anomaly, or monstrosity" (57). Derrida's deconstruction of the "edge, borderline, boundary, and abounding" implied by the law of genre particularly informs my fifth chapter.

[7] According to Levin, "The overreaching image, reinforced by the mighty line, sums up the whole dramatic predicament," so that "The stage becomes a vehicle for hyperbole . . ., by taking metaphors literally and acting concepts out" (24).

[8] Throughout this study, I adopt Marlowe's own spelling, "Phaeton," rather than the modern emendation "Phaethon."

[9] See Jump 104n. Marlowe echoes a line from the tale of _Shores Wife_ in the _Mirror_: "And bent the wand that might have growen ful streight" (line 140). Moreover, as Anthony Brian Taylor notes, "Marlowe's reading of _The Mirror for Magistrates_ is also reflected on two other occasions [in _Hero and Leander_ and in _Tamburlaine_] when he echoes lines from 'tragedies' which, like _Shores Wife_, appeared in the 1563 edition" (336).

[10] Ribner's edition reproduces the play's title-pages, each of which (with the exception of the corrupt _Massacre at Paris_) specifies generic status by the use of the word

"Tragicall" (Tamburlaine 49; Edward II 281; Dr. Faustus 355) or "Tragedie" (Dido 1; cf. The Jew of Malta 175). See Lalka 2-3.

[11] Nicoll points out that "at the close of the sixteenth century this word 'tragedy' was finally and almost exclusively connected with death by murder" (83). See also Rossiter, who attempts to arrive at an a posteriori definition of tragedy, based on Elizabethan theory and practice: "Tragedy, in Shakespeare's own usage, seems to mean 'an alarming calamity, usually bloody, and often determined by the plotted designs of someone'. When not plotted, it means simply 'a calamitous fall'" (254). Rossiter indicates the difference between Marlovian and Shakespearean tragedy when he says, "by c. 1599 Shakespeare was aware that he was writing something different from what had been 'tragedy' at the time when he most used the word in his plays, five to ten years earlier. Accordingly, he avoided the word in his Tragedies" (255).

[12] Parker argues that "dilation" functions "as a kind of semantic crossroads, a complex in which constructs rhetorical and narrative, philosophical and theological, judicial and erotic overlap as figures for the space and time of the text itself" ("Dilation" 520). See also Inescapable Romance, where Parker explores dilation and the related concept of "error" in romance works by Ariosto, Spenser, Milton, and Keats: this study aims to

explore "the problem of poetic closure or of narrative 'ending' (3), and "to provide a context for modern theories of narrative and linguistic 'error' by suggesting that 'error's' romance, and Romantic, history" (4). The title essay of Parker's most recent study, Literary Fat Ladies, examines the feminization of dilation or copia by Renaissance writers. See also Terence Cave, who examines the importance of copia for French Renaissance writers.

[13] Ethel Seaton argues that Marlowe was probably well read in romance literature: "The romances are the culture bed in which the seeds of Marlowe's young imagination germinated. It is no wonder that, crossed with classical and oriental stocks, the full flowering is exotic, flamboyant, brilliant in colour and light" (35).

[14] Here I deliberately echo Kermode: "Since we continue to 'prescribe laws to nature'--Kant's phrase, and we do--we shall continue to have a relation with the paradigms, but we shall change them to make them go on working. If we cannot break free of them, we must make sense of them" (24). Marlowe's own "relation with the paradigms" becomes clear through an examination of his breaking of generic form: that act of liberation, in my reading, provides a way for Marlowe to make sense of the (moralized) conventions that undergird social, political, and of course literary structures of authority. See

Bloom's perceptive comments about the ways in which "Poems instruct us in how they break form to bring about meaning, so as to utter a complaint, a moaning intended to be all their own" ("Breaking" 1). Marlowe's oeuvre supports Bloom's statement that the power of poetry stems from the "powers of poems already written, or rather, already read" (3).

[15] For the most useful comparisons of Marlowe and Shakespeare, see F. P. Wilson, who concludes by stressing Shakespeare's orthodox notions of order, in contrast to Marlowe's ambiguity; and Nicholas Brooke, who sees "Marlowe as a Provocative Agent in Shakespeare's Early Plays." Bradbrook's early suggestion that Edward II is Marlowe's most mature (because most "Shakespearean") work (164) continues to be echoed even in more recent Marlowe criticism. See, for example, Sanders's argument that Marlowe lacks a "capacity for inwardness," while the greater genius Shakespeare "possessed supremely this inner stability" (327). Sanders concludes that the difference between the two contemporary writers is "a measure of the creative spirit's independence of the Zeitgeist" (327).

[16] Fanta's brief monograph shows that Marlowe's moral ambiguity results from two features of his plays: the presence of virtuous characters ("agonists") who by inviting our identification qualify our admiration for the overreaching protagonists; and, in the plays' outcomes, the

lack of that reconstructed moral framework which in Shakespeare compensates for the tragic strife. Fanta, however, focusses mainly on the first feature and notes only by way of conclusion that the absence of virtuous characters at the end of Marlowe's plays, "besides contributing to the moral ambiguity of his plays, makes Marlowe's tragedies more fiercely pessimistic and less spiritually fulfilling than Shakespeare's tragic masterpieces" (45).

[17] The most important biographies of Marlowe are Bakeless; Boas, Marlowe and His Circle; Eccles; Kocher, Christopher Marlowe; and Tucker Brooke's Life of Marlowe, which appears with his edition of Dido in Case's six-volume edition of Marlowe's works, and which first reproduced the Baines note in full (98-100). For a more recent discussion of the admissibility of Baines's testimony against Marlowe, see Kuriyama ("Marlowe, Shakespeare"), who at present is reportedly working on a new biography of Marlowe. Tucker Brooke also reprints several Renaissance accounts of Marlowe's death, Thomas Beard being perhaps the first writer to present Marlowe's death as a kind of tragedy of divine retribution--"not only a manifest signe of Gods iudgement, but also an horrible and fearefull terrour to all that beheld him" (Life 113). On Marlowe's mysterious tragic end, see also Friedenreich's stimulating essay "Marlowe's Endings."

[18] Michel Foucault, in recording the "death of the author," argues that the author's name is a function of discourse--which "serves as a means of classification," "establishes different forms of relationships among texts," and "characterizes a particular manner of existence of discourse" (123). My study of Marlowe shares this notion of the author as a dispersed effect of the constitutive conventions of literary and cultural discourse; and it explores precisely those "relationships of homogeneity, filiation, reciprocal explanation, authentification, or of common utilization" established among Marlowe's works (123). But, to use Culler's words, my study "cannot for all that dispense with the individual subject" (Structuralist Poetics 30). Marlowe as the agent (if not the definitive originating source) of his works remains an important postulate in my attempt to delineate his creative appropriations of literary convention.

ACT I

"This unfinished Tragedy": Dilation in Hero and Leander

When the first printer of Hero and Leander, Edward Blount, introduced the poem as an "unfinished Tragedy," he heralded a reading that became standard in Marlowe criticism for almost four centuries. To Marlowe's last line, Blount added the words Desunt nonnulla ("several [lines] are missing") and assumed that Marlowe's sudden death prevented him from completing the poem as he had intended. Blount regarded Marlowe's ostensible omissions as such a serious defect, in fact, that he appended Chapman's "continuation," with its antithetical version of the Hero and Leander tale, to Marlowe's poem. Many modern editors, by continuing to bind together Marlowe and Chapman, implicitly agree with Blount that Marlowe's poem is somehow incomplete by itself.[1] Modern critics, too, until recently have largely sustained Blount's assumption by referring to the poem as "unfinished" or a "fragment."[2] C. S. Lewis exemplifies this common argument in his article "Hero and Leander," where he justifies the "lucky accident" that yoked together Marlowe's and Chapman's versions (250), on the grounds that the original myth had a tragic ending, and that Marlowe's version provokes our "aesthetic interests [to] demand a second, downward movement" (240).

However, it is unclear why, as Lewis claims, "A story cannot properly end with the two chief characters dancing on the edge of a cliff" (240). In fact Marlowe did end his poem in precisely this way, deferring that "second, downward movement" demanded by both the traditional source and our aesthetic expectations. Marlowe, that is, chose to subvert those expectations that Chapman (and later editors) satisfied at the risk of the original poem's integrity. What is at stake in the editorial and critical debate over Hero and Leander is, of course, the issue of closure. Barbara Herrnstein Smith addresses the issue in Poetic Closure, where she states, "a structure appears 'closed' when it is experienced as integral: coherent, complete, and stable" (2). Marlowe critics who challenge above all the "completeness" of Hero and Leander do so because they see the poem's structure as ultimately tragic, mirroring its source.[3]

Examining the poem on its own terms, however, will show that the ultimate deferral of our aesthetic expectations is in keeping with Marlowe's aim throughout the poem. The pleasure afforded by Hero and Leander, like that of poetry in general, "derives largely from the tensions created by local deferments of resolution and evasions of expectation" (Herrnstein Smith 3). Marlowe further intensifies this pleasure at the end of his narrative poem by giving us just that kind of cliff-hanger (not "proper" but indecorous) to which Lewis and others cannot give credence.

More recently, critics have begun to argue that Hero and Leander can and should be read "as a self-sufficient poem" (Keach 115).[4] And, while Roma Gill's recent authoritative edition of Marlowe's Hero and Leander, which allows the poem to stand on its own merits, promises to remedy what has been a chronic critical oversight, the question still arises, why has Marlowe's poem suffered from such a troubled reception history? The answer lies both in readerly expectations, invoked by the text itself, and in what Heather Dubrow has called "authorial" expectations, fostered by a contextual knowledge of Marlowe and his oeuvre. Dubrow suggests, provocatively, that authorial expectations--"what we know of the writer's previous work in that genre and of his general attitudes to tradition"--may influence or even complicate generic expectations (108). Not surprisingly, Dubrow uses Marlowe's Jew of Malta to illustrate the complex interplay between "authorial" and generic signals. In the case of Hero and Leander, a previous knowledge of Marlowe's other tragedies can lead to a reading of his narrative poem as an incomplete tragedy. By contrast, a perception of Marlowe's own unconventionality can intensify our sense of the poem's deviation from convention. Indeed, throughout this study we will explore the extent to which Marlowe's "characteristic iconoclasm"--not just in The Jew of Malta, but (to advance Dubrow) throughout his entire oeuvre--"prepares us to notice his deviations from the very expectations he has so carefully established" (Dubrow 109).

The narrator of Hero and Leander, by all accounts one of the poem's most strikingly ambiguous features, fosters the expectation of tragedy by continually pointing not only to the most famous classic version of the Hero and Leander story--that of Musaeus--but also to other tragic narratives. Marlowe deliberately embroils the reader with the narrative by putting into play certain expectations of a "completed" version (or versions), only to frustrate those expectations through the use of ironic and often comic reversals. And to the repertoire of prior narratives, mainly classical in origin, that adumbrate his revision of the Hero and Leander story, Marlowe can be seen to add, playfully, even his own favourite tragic mythoi. Even as he alludes to authoritative tragic writers or tragic tales, he echoes his own tragic works. This chapter begins by exploring the narrator's manipulation of readerly expectations, before turning to the context of Marlowe's tragedies in order to suggest the way authorial expectations have intersected with generic expectations to influence the reading of the poem as an "unfinished Tragedy."

i.

The essential key to an investigation of readerly expectations in Hero and Leander is, of course, the narrator, who establishes such an intimate yet problematical relationship with the reader.[5] Conspicuous by his high degree of self-consciousness, Marlowe's narrator draws attention as much to the act of narration as to the events in the story itself. The narratological distinction between the deigetic level of the text, constituted by the events of the story or "diegesis" (Prince 20) and the extradiegetic level, marked by the act of narration existing "above" the story (Prince 29), aids our understanding of the poem's ironic effects. The central diegetic conflict, which produces much of the poem's humour, consists of Hero and Leander's frustrated efforts to become lovers. But at the extradiegetic level, the narrator wages a conflict with the prior literary tradition out of which he creates his work. Literary tradition, indeed, plays such a prominent role in Hero and Leander that it might be considered the principal antagonist of the work. The mistaken tendency to regard Marlowe's poem as fragmentary stems in large part from the inability to account for the central significance of literary tradition in the poem.

At both the diegetic and extradiegetic levels, the conflict in Hero and Leander depends upon the deferral of expectation. In transforming his narrative material, Marlowe uses the rhetorical technique of dilatio, which in the Renaissance could refer both to the spatial expansion and temporal deferral of a narrative (Parker, "Dilation" 520). Marlowe "dilates" Musaeus, for example, by expanding certain episodes and deferring others. From Musaeus's classic tragedy Marlowe takes only the episodes involving the lovers' initial meeting, courtship, and union, and these he amplifies into a poem twice the length of Musaeus's. But, even more significantly, Marlowe places the lovers' deaths outside the boundaries of his own text, and thus delays indefinitely the original tragedy. Delay plays a crucial part not only in the strategy of narration, but also in the story itself. Just as the narrator postpones the implied tragic ending, so he postpones for much of the poem Hero and Leander's goal of sexual union. Marlowe's poem is a prime example of dilatio, for it reveals what Patricia Parker has called the "intersection of erotic and textual strategies" of dilation ("Dilation" 529). Both strategies entail the manipulation of readerly expectations. Hero and Leander, indeed, corresponds to Barthes' notion of the writerly text, which demands not so much to be read but rewritten, reconstituted, by its reader.[6]

Hero and Leander shows with especial clarity the way in which Marlowe manipulates prior literary tradition to provoke ambivalent responses in his readers. In selecting a love-tragedy that would have been very familiar to his readers, and inscribing reminders of prior authoritative versions within his text, Marlowe plays with his readers' expectations, particularly their generic expectations. While he initially intensifies the expectation that the poem will end tragically, he ultimately defers the tragic ending and, in a virtuoso literary performance, accomplishes a comic dilation of the well-known tragedy. Hero and Leander will thus serve as a useful introduction to the problem of generic transformation in Marlowe's plays.

Marlowe's readers in coming to his poem would have had pre-conceived notions about the tragic structure of the narrative. The deaths of Hero and Leander were legendary. For example, Abraham Fraunce has Venus recite to Adonis the tale of "How Laeander dyde, as he swamme to the bewtiful Hero" (111). Fraunce also underscores the widespread popularity of the story: "Leander and Heroes loue is in euery mans mouth" (117). Indeed, as a glance at Douglas Bush's list of versions will attest (123-24), the tragic tale provided one of the most popular subjects for storytelling in the European Renaissance (cf. Braden 55).

For Renaissance readers, there were two main classical sources for the lovers' story: the Greek writer Musaeus's epic poem, which takes the lovers through their initial romantic encounter to their final tragic deaths; and Ovid's epistolary version in his Heroides, which includes two letters, one from Leander to Hero and one from Hero in reply.[7] Both Musaeus's and Ovid's versions place considerable emphasis on the ultimate tragic end of the lovers, though the lovers' deaths lie, strictly speaking, outside the confines of Ovid's text. Marlowe creates his own reading of the story, and complicates our reading, by playing the two classical authorities off against each other. The following section of this chapter explores the way in which Marlowe skews Musaeus in the direction of Ovid, by overlaying and overturning Musaeus's epic tragedy with an ironic Ovidian eroticism: his dilation of the familiar narrative can be considered an "erotic dilation." But first let us consider dilation as a textual--more specifically, a generic--strategy that Marlowe uses both to manipulate readerly expectations and to reform literary tradition.

The sole classical pedigree cited by Marlowe in Hero and Leander is Musaeus, and readings of the poem have thus, perhaps not surprisingly, focussed on the interrelation between Marlowe and Musaeus. Roma Gill, for instance, while acknowledging both Ovid and Musaeus as potential sources, claims that Marlowe owes a "greater debt" to Musaeus (Complete Works 178). Accordingly, Gill spends most of her introduction to Hero and Leander investigating the poem as an "imitation" of Musaeus (xiv). Gill's emphasis proceeds from the allusion to Musaeus in the poem: "Amorous Leander, beautifull and yoong, / (Whose tragedie divine Musaeus soong)" (51-52).[8] Certainly, "Marlowe's reference to his predecessor (or 'pattern') is significant" (Gill, Complete Works xiv). But the precise significance of the reference lies in its function as generic signal, which Marlowe prominently places in the poem to raise the reader's expectation that the genre encountered will be tragedy. As Gill's own discussion demonstrates, Marlowe's poem becomes not just an "imitation" but a parody of Musaeus, and Musaeus's tragedy becomes Marlowe's comedy.

Readers of Marlowe's poem, even from its earliest publication, seem to insist on judging it in relation to Musaeus. Indeed, the history of the poem's reception shows the success with which Marlowe has evoked the expectation of a tragic ending. The widespread critical assumption that the poem is a fragment implies a standard of completion against which the poem is being judged: the suggestion is that Marlowe was bound to take his lovers to their deaths as did his named precursor. George Chapman took upon himself the task of completing Marlowe's poem precisely by chronicling those deaths, along with "the last affections of the first two Lovers that ever Muse shrinde in the Temple of Memorie" (Bowers 2: 455). Naming that "first Author, divine Musaeus," in his Dedication, Chapman suggests that his continuation follows directly from Musaeus's epic poem, although, since Marlowe similarly invokes "divine Musaeus" in his own poem, Chapman's reference also deals a corrective blow to that "second Author." The Renaissance did consider Musaeus "divine," as well as a contemporary of Orpheus. As Gordon Braden points out, Musaeus's Hero and Leander was for the Renaissance "an extraordinarily primal text," thought to be "the earliest versified tragedy of love" (56). Chapman suggests as much when he concludes his continuation by asserting, "this true honor from their love-deaths sprung, / They were the first that ever Poet sung" (Bowers, lines 292-93).

Marlowe painstakingly implies (initially at least) that his poem will also be a tragedy in Musaeus's tradition. The poem invites comparison with Musaeus's not just because it names the Greek poet but also because it borrows its very title from Musaeus (rather than from Ovid). Of course, as Alastair Fowler outlines, the title of a literary work, no less than a literary allusion to a previous writer, often functions as an important generic indicator (88-98). More than merely recalling Musaeus, of course, Marlowe's title recalls Musaeus's tragedy.[9] The titles of all Marlowe's plays, similarly, can be seen to imply a tragic narrative that effectively prejudices an initial reading. Merely by focussing on the name of the central protagonist (or, in the case of The Massacre at

Paris, by alluding to that protagonist's victims, whose murders demand a retributive vengeance), Marlowe's dramatic titles allude to the familiar defeat of his famous tragic heroes.

Not only in its title but particularly in its opening lines, Hero and Leander seems to signal its generic status as tragedy. The concentration of tragic indicators at the outset of the poem is not surprising, for, as Fowler argues, "[t]he generic markers that cluster at the beginning of a work have a strategic role in guiding the reader. They help to establish, as soon as possible, an appropriate mental 'set' that allows the work's generic codes to be read" (88). The first line of the poem, following fast on the heels of the familiar title, seems to point proleptically to a tragedy in the poem while reminding the reader of another famous tragic story, also set "On Hellespont guiltie of True-loves blood." The allusion is to the tale of the lovers Helle and Phryxis: fleeing from their stepmother's cruelty, they were carried through the air by a golden-fleeced ram when Helle, becoming giddy, fell and drowned. Helle's tragic end mirrors Leander's, for the river in which she fell, and which now bears her name, is the same river that legend reports to have claimed the life of Leander.[10] Yet the poem, while invoking Leander's tragic end at the very outset, will ultimately defer that end.

The opening description of Hero, an inimitable Renaissance example of the rhetorical figure _prosographia_, also contains ample matter for tragedy. As commentators have pointed out, Hero's robe resembles the traditional garb of the medieval goddess Fortuna (Cantelupe 297), a central controlling figure in tragedy. That robe seems to portend tragic sacrifice, and certainly makes Hero look sinister, for it glistens with "many a staine, / Made with the blood of wretched Lovers slaine" (15-16). As "_Venus_ Nun" (45, 319), Hero presides over the annual festival of Adonis. Even with this briefest of allusions to "Rose-cheekt _Adonis_" (93), whose bloody death Venus mourned inconsolably, the narrator summons up in its entirety yet another tragic narrative that seems to foreshadow the doomed fate of _his_ pair of budding lovers, thus recalling the "True-loves blood" of the opening line. That the narrator means the reference to Adonis as a portent of disaster becomes clear when he speaks of "this feast day, O cursed day and hower" (131). The festival displays Hero in all her sinister glory, performing the rites of Venus which involve "sacrificing turtles blood" (158). Furthermore, these apparent foreshadowings of an impending tragedy in the poem imply that one of Hero's most memorable characteristics--her footwear--is not purely fortuitous. She sports, with apparent purpose, the conventional footwear of the tragic performer: "Buskins of shels all silvered, used she" (31).

Yet, despite these tragic signposts, Marlowe's narrator has already begun to infuse his narrative material with comic flourishes. Marlowe deflates the stately subject matter and serious tone of tragedy, which conventionally mirrors the social hierarchy by upholding notions of Degree and often paints a sterile landscape when Degree crumbles. Marlowe moves his poem into the realm of comedy, to use the generic sense of the term, which denotes a world where the overturning of Degree produces no disastrous effect but rather evokes the sheer joy of play. Marlowe's transformation of the Hero and Leander story stimulates the common comic response in the reader, laughter. At times his hyperbolic description of Hero's dress moves into the realm of the ridiculous: Hero's breath is so sweet that it attracts honey-seeking bees that hover near her mouth (21-24); her appearance outdoes nature so well that the pearl and gold sparrows embroidered on her buskins come to life and chirp. Marlowe's imagery here exaggerates nature's overflowing fertility, in contrast to the conventional sterile images of tragedy. By treating these buskins comically, the narrator deflates the image of Hero as a dread priestess of Venus. But it is the first feminine rhyme in the poem that makes the admixture of comedy unmistakably clear. Cupid is struck blind by Hero, not because of her beauty but because "so like was one the other, / As he imagyn'd Hero was his mother" (39-40).

In the description of Leander, the narrator similarly overlays his tragic matter with comic constructions. The forboding reference to Leander's "tragedie," which "divine Musaeus soong" (52), obviously steers the reader in the direction of tragedy. But the narrator piles up mythological allusions--a kind of narrative shorthand easily decipherable by the Renaissance reader--to infuse his material with comic incongruities. One of the most successful comic techniques in the poem is the narrator's frequent deflation of an heroic mythological narrative by applying it to Leander's situation. An important example of this technique occurs early in the description of Leander:

> His dangling tresses that were never shorne,
> Had they been cut, and unto Colchos borne,
> Would have allur'd the vent'rous youth of Greece,
> To hazard more, than for the golden Fleece.
> (55-58)

This passage epitomizes Marlowe's remarkable "translation" of tragic narrative material into comic terms. Marlowe handles well-known mythological narratives precisely as he handles Musaeus's original narrative: while by the mere mention of a character's name, he invokes the entire narrative, he explicitly treats only a segment or "narreme" (Prince 66)[11] and ends by fundamentally rewriting the traditional source. He stitches together classical and biblical allusion but uses both in the service of mock-heroic comedy.

First, by attributing to Leander unshorne locks, the narrator evokes the tragic tale of Samson, only to deflate the tragic heroism inherent in the tale. Leander's "dangling tresses"--terms that usually connote women's hair--ill befit the head of a divinely inspired warrior. Indeed, the cutting of Leander's hair, unlike that of Samson's, would apparently not denude his strength; rather, the act would lead to something more adventurous (and, by implication, more illicit) than Jason's seizure of the golden fleece. Marlowe has not Delilah, the infamous siren type, but Jason, a reverenced epic hero, profit from the precious hair.

Yet Marlowe's parodic use of mythology does not end here. The narrator not only overturns the tragic narrative of Samson, he also looks back to his own earliest allusion to tragedy in the first line of the poem. In accusing the Hellespont of being "guilty of True-loves blood," he had alluded to the tale of the tragically fated Helle and her brother Phryxis, and conflated Helle's tragedy with Leander's. Indeed, the narrator intensifies the tragic imagery by using the word "blood" as a symbol of the drowned Helle's (bloodless) death: for the Renaissance, tragedy conventionally implies a violent, untimely end.

The narrator further recalls the story of the tragic Helle and Phryxis by taking later episodes, implicit but not directly referred to in his first reference. After Helle falls off the back of the golden-fleeced ram into the Hellespont, her brother Phryxis is borne aloft to "Colchos," where before acrificing the ram he cuts off its fleece and preserves it as a treasure, which Jason later seizes. In Marlowe's parodic mythopoeia, Leander's hair becomes not just like Samson's hair, fabled for its power, but, even more marvellously, like the ram's golden fleece, the matchless qualities of which the Renaissance associated with the alchemist's dream. This hyperbolic description of Leander's hair, recalling in its outrageousness the description of "Hero the faire, / Whom young Apollo courted for her haire" (5-6), exemplifies the way in which Marlowe's mythopoeia in Hero and Leander "functions specifically as an instrument of humour" (Morris, "Comic Method" 129).

When the narrator, tongue-in-cheek, proceeds to compare Leander with other mythological figures famous for their ability to arouse not just erotic, but specifically homosexual, desire, Leander's epicene beauty becomes comically incongruous in a poem that purportedly deals with heterosexual love: "Some swore he was a maid in mans attire, / For in his lookes were all that men desire" (83-84). Leander is likened to the Renaissance archetype of the homosexual lover, Ganymede: "Jove might have sipt out Nectar from his hand" (62). Throughout the poem, the narrator continues to make Leander's effeminate appearance, as well as his sexual naivete, the butt of his ironic humour, nowhere more hilariously than in Leander's struggles with Neptune in the Hellespont. Under attack by the god's amorous advances, "Leander made replie, / You are deceav'd, I am no woman I" (675-76). In the poem's opening descriptions, in fact, the narrator casts himself as a Neptune-like admirer of Leander who seems far more attracted to Leander than to Hero.

With the poem's second feminine rhyme, even the narrator's attraction to Leander becomes an object of ironic humour:

> Even as delicious meat is to the tast,
> So was his necke in touching, and surpast
> The white of Pelops shoulder, I could tell ye,
> How smooth his brest was, & how white his bellie . . .
> (63-66)

The forced rhyme of "tell ye . . . bellie," which has the effect of distorting the pronunciation of the second word to "bell-ye" (Bieman 71), is consonant with the strained hyperboles of the entire passage. The allusion to "Pelops," in addition, cloaks another reference to Leander's homosexual appeal--an appeal felt in this case by the narrator. Pelops was cut up and cooked by his father

Tantalus as a meal for the gods, who wisely perceived the trick, though not before Demeter (in some accounts, Thetis) accidentally ate one of Pelops's shoulders. After punishing Tantalus, Zeus resurrected Pelops, whereupon his missing shoulder was replaced with an ivory prosthesis (Graves 2: 25-28). Part of the wittiness of the comparison between Pelops and Leander lies in Marlowe's synaesthetic mingling of the sensuous imagery of taste and touch: touching Leander's neck is like tasting delicious meat, and the experience surpasses the smooth deliciousness associated with Pelops's shoulder.

However, the context of the poem affords the reference to Pelops even greater significance, for with the hero's name alone the narrator conjures up the complete narrative, which has remarkable relevance for Leander's later situation. Pelops is one of the gods' many amorous objects, for after he is resurrected and repaired, Poseidon falls in love with him and carries him in his winged chariot to Mount Olympus, where he makes him "his cup-bearer and bed-fellow" (Graves 2: 27). The narrator himself alludes to this section of the story when he writes of those unnamed "immortal fingars" (67) imprinted on Leander's back. Moreover, the narrator tellingly juxtaposes the comparison of Leander and Ganymede with that of Leander and Pelops. The image of Jove sipping nectar from Leander's Ganymede-like hand is followed immediately by his comparison with his luscious precursor, Pelops. The myths of Pelops and Ganymede, in fact, exhibit striking structural similarities, often noted by classical authors. Pindar, for example, narrates that Poseidon, "enthralled with love" for Pelops, transported him to "the highest home of Zeus, . . . that home to which, in after-time, Ganymede was also brought for the self-same service" (8).[12] Apollodorus, too, stresses that Pelops, "on account of his surpassing beauty . . . became a minion of Poseidon" (157). In Marlowe's poem, Leander's beauty, which invokes and yet surpasses the loveliness embodied in "[t]he white of Pelops shoulder," also sparks Poseidon's--that is, Neptune's--rapturous love. In this initial invocation of Pelops, Marlowe parodies classical typology by making Pelops merely a type or prefiguration of Leander, who represents in the fullness of his beauty the definitive antitype. Yet, though Leander also contends with Neptune's advances, and calls upon the god for help (as did Pelops in his suit for the hand of the beautiful Hippodameia), he finally is not--at least, not within the confines of Marlowe's poem--carried off to Olympus to be Neptune's cup-bearer and bed-fellow.

The narrator's method of invoking mythological narratives purposely to abridge, deflate, or reverse them (often with comic results) attests to his agonistic relation to prior literary authority. His abridgement of

Musaeus's authoritative version likewise represents a radical revision of literary tradition. One of the most significant consequences of clipping Musaeus's narrative immediately after the point of the lovers' consummation is that the narrator can deliberately bypass what Chapman could not: the inclination to moralize, to posit a causal relation between the lovers' illicit union and their subsequent tragedy. Gone are Musaeus's references to the lovers' unwed, unsanctioned status (179-80, 222-23), references which Chapman reinserts and multiplies (*de casibus*-style) as warnings of their imminent fall.

We have already examined in some detail one of the narrator's chief techniques for dilating the original tragedy: embedded narratives. Into his primary narrative of Hero and Leander, the narrator embeds or inserts a myriad of other mythological narratives, all possessing ostensible relevance to the lovers' situation. Often these myths are economically invoked by the barest mention of a name; sometimes, however, they represent a lengthy interruption of the main narrative--as in the case of the two long digressions involving Mercury and the country maid, and Leander and Neptune. Both of these digressions allow the narrator, even while postponing the original tragedy, to point towards it, by emphasizing the tragic necessity that will ultimately confront the lovers. Leander's struggles with Neptune, though they interrupt the main narrative dealing with his courtship of Hero, at the same time foreshadow his eventual watery death.

Similarly, the embedded narrative of Mercury and the country maid is introduced at a crucial moment in the lovers' courtship, just as Hero's heart has been pierced with love for Leander, and thus it halts the flow of the main narrative action. Yet Mercury's adventures with the country maid, and Cupid's related dealings with the Destinies, also forecast the lovers' inevitable downfall. Cupid, pitying Hero's plight, pleads with the Destinies that the lovers "Both might enjoy ech other, and be blest" (380). But those "angrie sisters" (473) will suppress the happiness of Hero and Leander, even as they keep down Learning, which "in despight of Fate, / Will mount aloft, and enter heaven gate" (465-66). Even in Marlowe's version, Cupid is powerless to rewrite the authoritative destinal narrative. Marlowe's inventive digression dramatizes what in Musaeus's version is only a suggestive sentence: "Love could not fend off the Fates" (Musaeus, line 323).[13] In his version of the Hero and Leander story, Marlowe may not entirely fend off the fatal end of the lovers; but he does permit them, at least within the space of his poem, to attain a comic union and yet live. This textual dilation of Musaeus's tragic plot provides one of the narrator's chief means of manipulating the reader's expectations.

ii.

Hero and Leander also uses what we might term "erotic dilation" as a means of structuring the narrative, and in so doing the poem owes as much to Ovid as to Musaeus, although the former debt rarely receives adequate acknowledgement. In Ovid's Ars Amatoria, as Parker shows, "delay is the principal strategy of courtship, the postponing or putting off of consummation or coitus" ("Dilation" 528). Marlowe's postponement of his lovers' consummation makes the experience of reading Hero and Leander, as William Sheidley argues, quite literally a tantalizing one. In Musaeus, the lovers consummate their love repeatedly;[14] Marlowe has them wait until the poem's conclusion and thus superimposes on Musaeus's narrative what might be considered a distinctly Ovidian structure.

Ovid strategically dilates sexual consummation not only in the Ars Amatoria (as Parker points out), but, more significantly for Marlowe readers, in the Elegies, which Marlowe translated. The Elegies, in fact, contains the clearest Ovidian metaphor for the temporal deferral sought by love, a metaphor to which Marlowe in the tragedies repeatedly turns in order to emphasize tragic necessity, as my third and fourth chapters will examine in detail. The metaphor originates in Ovid's thirteenth elegy of Book One. The lover, desperate to prolong his night with his beloved, cries out for the delay of the dawn. In Marlowe's translation as well, Aurora's mounting of her "hatefull carriage" (Bowers, line 38) represents the end of love and the return of sober duty:

> Whither runst thou, that men, and women, love not?
> Hold in thy rosie horses that they move not.
>
> (lines 9-10)

Those "rosie horses"--which Marlowe elsewhere calls "the horses of the night" (Dido I.i.26), and to which his dying Faustus cries out, "O lente lente currite noctis equi!" (xix.139)--carry across the sky the coming day; the Ovidian lover hopes to slow their pace and defer the temporal necessity that will cut short love's pleasure.

Musaeus, whose epic poem shows "surprisingly close similarities of wording" with Ovid's version of the Hero and Leander story (Gelzer 304),[15] also makes night the lovers' ally and day their foe: "yearning for the secret bouts of night-long conversings / Often they prayed for the dark, their bridal attendant, to come" (lines 230-31). And in Marlowe's Hero and Leander, as the narrator prepares to conclude the lovers' long amorous dilation, represented by the dilatory space of the poem itself, Hero similarly desires the dawn's delay:

> And now she wisht this night were never done,
> And sigh'd to thinke upon th'approching sunne. . . .
>
> (785-86)

But Marlowe gives the conventional aubade a new twist by attributing to Hero's wish a comical (albeit modest) motive: fear that the daylight will fully expose her to Leander's view (789-808).

Marlowe further twists the convention in the final eight lines of the poem, where he reverses even his own established pattern of day and night imagery in the poem:

> By this _Appollos_ golden harpe began,
> To sound foorth musicke to the _Ocean_,
> Which watchfull _Hesperus_ no sooner heard,
> But he the days bright-bearing Car prepar'd.
> And ran before, as Harbenger of light,
> And with his flaring beamess mockt ougly night,
> Till she o'recome with anguish, shame, and rage,
> Dang'd downe to hell her loathsome carriage.
> (811-15)

The narrator has attributed feminine qualities to Night earlier in the poem, when he offers what Chapman glossed as "_A periphrasis of night_" (Bowers, lines 189-91); but there the observation that "darke night is _Cupids_ day" (191) makes Night the agent of love, not its "ougly" nemesis. The end of the poem confronts the reader with a sudden, startling reversal: Night's "loathsome carriage" (818) is "o'recome" (817) by "days bright-bearing Car" (814). The sun that before crept downward, "pittying these lovers" (584), to allow them the cover of "secret trustie night" (587), now cooperates with that "false morne" (805) breaking from Hero's blushing face. Hero's blush betrays her to Leander's greedy gaze ("And her all naked to his sight displayd" [808]). Day will only further expose her, just as it leaves Night "o'recome with anguish, shame, and rage" (817).

Hero's complete, inescapable exposure to Leander's (but not the reader's) sight is a fitting conclusion for a poem that has tantalized the reader, like Leander, with occasional glimpses of Hero, while seeming to promise an ultimate revelation and the lovers' sexual consummation. The final reversal of day and night imagery, playing as it does with readerly expectations and forcing the reader to become actively involved in solving the conundrum, and hence in constructing textual meaning, corresponds to the technique of the poem elsewhere.

For example, when Leander, after having braved many obstacles that comically prolong his courtship, succeeds in getting to Hero's tower for the first time, the narrator deceives the reader into thinking that they consummate their love: "He askt, she gave, and nothing was denied, / Both to each other quickly were affied" (509-10). It comes as a jolt to the reader that Leander has in fact not performed the "amorous rites" (548). He has only "as a brother with his sister toyed, / Supposing nothing else was to be done" (536-37). Hero keeps her virginity intact during this initial encounter, whose tantalizing quality is significantly emphasized with a highly appropriate metaphor:

> Shee, with a kind of graunting, put him by it,
> And ever as he thought himselfe most nigh it,
> Like to the tree of Tantalus she fled,
> And seeming lavish, sav'de her maydenhead.
> (557-60)

Hero, or (by implied metonymy) her maidenhead, is like the fruit of Tantalus's tree, which pulls away from his grasp whenever he reaches for it in Hades. And in delaying the moment of sexual consummation, the narrator makes not only Leander a type of Tantalus, but the reader as well.

The poem supplies thematic justification for its erotic dilation: love's strife. Hero and Leander's union is delayed because love always involves strife or a power-struggle of sorts: "Love is not full of pittie (as men say) / But deaffe and cruell, where he meanes to pray" (771-72). As Jane Adamson argues, "The whole of Hero and Leander is pervaded by Marlowe's interest in striving; and strife in various forms--cosmic, martial, psychic and sexual--is everywhere the source of the poem's comic wit" (66-67). The narrator (turned mythographer) also implicitly links the strife that is characteristic of Hero and Leander's "deaffe and cruell" love with those titanic struggles of the "gods in sundrie shapes, / Committing headdie ryots, incest, rapes" (143-44). Hero and Leander contains a veritable catalogue of erotic love-stories, each showing one lover's attempts to gain power over another.

The two long narrative digressions with which Marlowe dilates the original story have plots structured on lovers' strivings: Leander strives with Neptune, the country maid with Mercury. The latter digression functions as a *mise en abyme* narrative, mirroring Hero's desperate attempts to preserve her virginity, and using the Ovidian technique of erotic dilation to spin out its plot. The country maid, "Whose only dower was her chasititie" (412), is also a coy mistress who tries to delay love's consummation. She fends off Mercury's advances, much as Hero does Leander's. Yet Mercury, like Leander, constantly seeks to expose her and, as the narrator mock-heroically puts it, "discover / The way to new *Elisium*" (410-11):

> he often strayed
> Beyond the bounds of shame, in being bold
> To eie those parts, which no eie should behold.
> (406-08)

The nymph's total exposure, associated like Hero's with the loss of virginity, is however forestalled by her excuses. Her prolongation of Neptune's wooing becomes in fact representative of the dilatory behaviour of all women in similar circumstances: "Still vowed he love, she wanting no excuse / To feed him with delaies, as women use" (425-26).[16] The narrator's generalization about women is quickly recalled when, less than a hundred lines later, Hero in her flight from Leander finds "many poore excuses . . . To linger by the way" (490-91). She finds a conventional excuse to linger by dropping her painted fan, though Leander, "being a novice, knew not what she meant, / But stayd, and after her a letter sent" (497-98). The reference to Leander's letter should remind the reader of Ovid's epistolary version of Hero and Leander's tale in the _Heroides_. Significantly, as we have seen, the courtship of Mercury and the country maid, like that of Hero and Leander, is indebted to Ovid at a much more fundamental level.

In subjecting Musaeus's epic poem to an Ovidian transformation, Marlowe recalls another aspect of Ovid's _Elegies_, in addition to its strategy of erotic dilation. In the eighteenth elegy of Book Two, Ovid introduces the notion that the genres of Tragedy and Elegy are competing for the poet's attention (cf. Book III, Elegy 1). Ovid's persona, whose mind is set on "battells" and tragic matters, is distracted by his mistress and persuaded to turn elegist: as Marlowe translates,

> . . . tragedies, and scepters fild my lines,
> But though I apt were for such high deseignes,
> Love laughed at my cloak, and buskines painted,
> And rule so soone with private hands acquainted.
>
> (13-16)

In the Elegies, as in Hero and Leander, what seemingly begins as a plan for tragic epic is thwarted in favour of more domestic, erotic concerns. To use Marlowe's translation, "love triumpheth ore his buskind Poet" (Gill, Complete Works II.xviii.18). If not elegy, Marlowe's Hero and Leander is a deferral of tragedy that represents love's triumph, or love's dilation, however ironically conceived. Marlowe reins in the "horses of the night," forestalling for Hero and Leander the dawn of tragic necessity, as Ovid never did.

iii.

It is difficult to read Hero and Leander without seeing it in relation to the rest of Marlowe's canon. This is so not merely because, in general, the author--or "author-function"--provides the reader with one of the chief means of finding patterns of significance in a literary work.[17] Marlowe further encourages us to situate his erotic poem in the context of his other works because he variously recalls those works in Hero and Leander, by using familiar imagery and rhetorical techniques, for instance, or by actually plagiarizing himself. In other words, Hero and Leander brings into play certain authorial expectations as a way of further manipulating the reader's generic expectations. A study of generic mixing in Marlowe's poem should not ignore this intersection of generic and authorial expectations. Indeed, the frequency with which the poem has been designated an "unfinished Tragedy" may well stem from the critical inclination to compare the poem with Marlowe's plays, each of which (as subsequent chapters show) also relies upon tragic conventions and various kinds of textual inscriptions to manipulate readerly responses.

Hero and Leander is most recognizably Marlovian in its repetition of the "overreacher" image, as well as in its related use of hyperbole. Harry Levin has identified the recurring type of the overreacher as not only distinctively Marlovian, but also distinctively tragic (158-61). Levin, in fact, would label Marlowe's preoccupation with the overreacher an "Icarus complex" which shows his predisposition for tragedy: "Since Icarus was the archetype of the overreacher, Marlowe was by temperament a tragedian" (159). The overreacher, whom Marlowe most often associates with the classical figures Phaeton and Icarus, aspires to heavenly power, but--since his reach always exceeds his grasp--that tragic project is doomed to failure. Phaeton and Icarus are familiar Renaissance types that warn of the consequences not only of hubris against the gods but also of rebellion against the father. Phaeton, whom Marlowe elsewhere refers to as "Clymene's brain-sick son" (Tamburlaine 1.IV.ii.49; 2.V.iii.231), begs his father Phoebus to allow him to perform the most dangerous and powerful task known to gods or humankind: to ride the sun's chariot across the sky. Taking the reins despite his father's agonized protestations, Phaeton loses control. His pride and foolhardiness spark a disaster of apocalyptic proportions in which heaven and earth blaze wildly, nature itself unseated and out of control. As Marlowe says of him in *1 Tamburlaine*, Phaeton "almost brent the axletree of heaven" (IV.ii.50). Icarus, like Phaeton a son who rebels "against the cosmic order" (Harry Levin 160), similarly eschews the golden mean and, disregarding paternal warnings, soars with his human-made wings too near the sun. His fall and subsequent death by drowning, while lacking the profound cosmic implications of Phaeton's fall, typify the fate of the aspiring, yet fated, tragic hero. Indeed, the first line of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*, which sets the scene near "*Hellespont* guiltie of True-loves blood," signals the importance of the fallen, drowned hero (Helle, as well as Icarus and Phaeton) as a recurring feature in Marlowe's private mythology.

Phaeton and Icarus, conspicuously present on the mythological roll-call in *Hero and Leander*, work in conjunction with the other tragic indicators in the poem to foreshadow the lovers' tragedy. Indeed, the poem's first line, which sets the scene near "*Hellespont* guiltie of True-loves blood," signals the importance of the fallen, drowned hero (Helle, as well as Icarus and Phaeton) as a recurring feature in Marlowe's private mythology. But, though they invite the reader to judge the poem in relation to Marlowe's other works, the context of the poem makes these classical images function in quite a different way. Marlowe, most obviously, delays the completion of this narrative as he allows his Leander to evade the foreseeable fate of drowning. Throughout the poem, our authorial expectations regarding the tragic import of Marlowe's Phaeton and Icarus images only further complicate the reading of the poem.

The narrator's convoluted reference to Phaeton, for example, while recalling that figure's conventionally tragic associations, comically turns back upon the narrator and becomes an ironic comment on the twists and turns of his descriptions. The narrator develops an elaborate conceit which finally culminates in the foreboding allusion to Phaeton's fall through lack of discipline:

> For everie street like to a Firmament
> Glistered with breathing stars, who where they went,
> Frighted the melancholie earth, which deem'd,
> Eternall heaven to burne, for so it seem'd,
> As if another Phaeton had got
> The guidance of the sunnes rich chariot.
>
> (97-102)

As he here sets the scene for the festival of Adonis, which will bring together Hero and Leander, the narrator attempts to underscore the bewitching, ominous quality of the encounter by suggesting that heaven and earth have become unnaturally commingled and point towards an impending cosmic disaster. Overpowered like so many of the lovers in the poem, earth is threatened by a heaven that seems ablaze with "glistering" stars, as it was when Phaeton failed to manage the horses of the sun. Now it seems that "another Phaeton" careens wildly in the heavens.[18] Yet, notwithstanding its tragic content, the reference to Phaeton is comic in effect. The many qualifying phrases, enclosed in commas, interrupt the flow of the passage and undercut the tragic force of the metaphor, so that the narrator's self-consciousness, not the foreshadowed disaster, becomes the reader's focus. The predominance of polysyllabic rhymes ("Firmament. . . where they went"; "had got. . . chariot") further gives the passage a contrived, self-conscious quality, yet another superimposition of comic (that is, humorous) elements on tragic material. The manner of the allusion, in other words, works at cross-purposes with its matter.

The reference to Icarus functions in much the same way. As Neptune comically toys with Leander in the Hellespont, the youth cries out that he must hurry to his beloved Hero: "O that these tardie armes of mine were wings, / And as he spake, upon the waves he springs" (689-90). This couplet contains an implicit allusion to Icarus, whose wings could not ultimately sustain his flight but, melting, "conspired his overthrow," as Marlowe writes in Dr. Faustus (Prol. 22).[19] Leander, like Icarus, will face a watery grave; he, too, is guilty of defiant hubris against the gods, because he rejects Neptune's love. But, despite the conventional tragic associations of the Icarus image, the passage develops an unmistakably comic incongruity between Leander's exaggerated wish to fly to Hero and his powerlessness at Neptune's hands: the naive exuberance of young love contrasts sharply--and humorously --with Leander's equally naive attractiveness to members not of the opposite, but of the same, sex. Unlike Icarus, moreover, Leander seems in no very grave danger. The narrator mitigates the tragic force of the Icarus allusion, for example, by softening Neptune's "revenging malice" (691) even as it surfaces. Not only does Neptune repent, almost immediately, of having flung his dangerous mace at Leander, but the mace boomerangs back to its owner and wounds Neptune--a slapstick touch. The incident gives rise to more comedy, more ironic misunderstandings between lover and beloved, as Leander's pity for Neptune escalates the god's hope that he has at last won Leander's love (691-704).

In Hero and Leander, Marlowe reappropriates for comic purposes the tragic images of Icarus and Phaeton, made familiar elsewhere to his readers. Another way of saying this is that Marlowe's revision of literary history extends not just to authorities such as Musaeus or Ovid, but to himself and his own oeuvre. Indeed, Hero and Leander plagiarizes a passage from one of Marlowe's tragedies that shares many other affinities with his erotic poem: Dido, Queen of Carthage. When Cupid pleads for Hero and Leander's happiness, the Destinies answer him "with a ghastly dreadfull countenaunce, / Threatning a thousand deaths at everie glaunce" (381-82, my emphasis). The underlined phrase is an exact citation of Dido, II.i.231.[20] This echo of Marlowe's tragic drama comes at the most ominous point in the poem, where it becomes clear that fate's decree regarding the lovers can be neither erased nor overwritten. The reminder of the larger Marlovian context surely intensifies the reader's experience of Hero and Leander as tragedy. Like Hero and Leander, Dido has much in common with the tragedy of passion,[21] though clearly Marlowe "finishes" Dido's tragedy where he leaves open-ended that of Hero and Leander.

Finally, if our knowledge of Marlowe's oeuvre intensifies our alertness to the tragic signals in Hero and Leander, that knowledge also prepares us to experience surprising reversals of convention. As Dubrow provocatively argues, "while Marlowe's generic signals prepare us to encounter the conventions of a given form, our knowledge of his characteristic iconoclasm--rhetorical, intellectual, and personal--simultaneously puts us on edge and hence prepares us to notice his deviations from the very expectations he has so carefully established" (108-09). Marlowe criticism, in fact, testifies to the strong influence that authorial expectations have exerted on readings of Marlowe's works. It is difficult to read _Hero and Leander_ without continually recalling Marlowe's notorious rebellion against authority, which is evidenced not only throughout his oeuvre, but also in contemporary statements about his life and attitudes.

If he distinguishes himself as one of literary history's most rebellious sons, Marlowe--like his favourites Icarus and Phaeton--strives after immortality (though of the poetic kind) by overthrowing his own paternal influences. In _Hero and Leander_, he eschews the golden mean of Musaeus, and even of Ovid, to chart his own defiant, untraditional course. The consummate irony facing Marlowe's reader is that his erotic poem has so often been denied the chance to soar on its own power. The frequency with which his ending has been designated "incomplete," by yoking it together implicitly with Musaeus's, or explicitly with Chapman's, suggests the impossibility of the attempt to break away from ancestral authority. Yet, if literary tradition continually claims centre-stage in _Hero and Leander_, the fate of the poem is ironically appropriate, for the history of its reception shows it struggling to free itself from the very history it attempts to rewrite.

Notes

[1] There are two editions of Hero and Leander commonly used as copy text, both printed in 1598. The first includes only Marlowe's poem, the second (the so-called 1598A edition) appends Chapman's version to Marlowe. Alexander, Bowers, Bullen, Donno, and Maclure use the second edition. Tucker Brooke alone among the early editors uses the earlier edition; other notable exceptions to the common practice are Louis L. Martz, and Pendry and Maxwell.

[2] For the designation "unfinished," see Levin 18, Collin 108, and Knoll 137. For the similar argument that the poem is a "fragment," see Bush 122; Miller 160; Morris, "Comic Method" 115; Hallett Smith, Elizabethan Poetry 78; and Zocca 232.

[3] Although, by her own admission, her study tends to minimize the importance of generic conventions in achieving satisfactory poetic closure, Herrnstein Smith does point out, "Our sense of the completeness of a form . . . often depends upon the class of forms with which we identify it" (26).

[4] See also Alexander 14.

[5] For discussions of the narrator's importance, see Cubeta and Knoll. See also Godshalk, who shows that the narrator's ineptitude in concluding the poem not "with resolution but with dissonance" underscores "Marlowe's

human comedy," specifically the tension between the worlds of "human morality" and "naturalistic sexuality" ("Hero and Leander" 312).

[6] Barthes values the writerly text because, in opposition to the readerly text, it makes the reader "no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text" ("Pleasure" 4). While Hero and Leander does not challenge codes of intelligibility to the same degree as a resolutely writerly text (such as Finnegans Wake), it clearly leaves the domain of the readerly whenever it "evades, parodies, or innovates upon prevailing conventions, and thus . . . shocks, baffles, and frustrates standard expectations in the process of reading" (Abrams 247). Specifically, Marlowe's use of erotic and textual dilation and of parody makes Hero and Leander a writerly text.

[7] For the modern English reader, the most accessible translations of Musaeus and Ovid are the Loeb Classical Library editions, to which I refer throughout this chapter.

[8] All quotations to Marlowe's poem refer to the excellent, most recent edition by Gill; line references follow in parentheses. Pending the eagerly awaited appearance of the forthcoming volumes in Gill's Oxford series, I cite Marlowe's plays (except for Dido, which is included in Gill's Oxford edition) in the best available single edition of each.

[9] In his brief discussion of titling conventions, Fowler points out that titles with "and" are common in love-tragedies, medieval romance, and the Renaissance erotic epyllion, and he mentions Marlowe's poem as a prime example of the latter (94-5). But Marlowe's Hero and Leander stands at the threshold of the epyllion tradition, before the conjunctive title had become a hallmark of the genre. Whereas Thomas Lodge's Scillaes metamorphosis could be so entitled in 1589, by 1610 it had been amended to A most pleasant historie of Glaucus and Scilla. Perhaps Marlowe's poem, given its popularity and influence, did much to establish this formulaic titling practice for the genre.

[10] Marlowe may here be echoing Ovid, who has Leander ironically reproach the Hellespont as the cause not just of his separation from Hero but also of Helle's infamous death (Heroides XVIII, line 141).

[11] Prince defines a "narreme" (also known variously as a "cardinal function," "nucleus," or "kernel") as a narrative unit that is "logically essential to the narrative action and cannot be eliminated without destroying its causal-chronological coherence" (11).

[12] The anonymous Charidemus, one of the apocryphal works of Lucian, contains comments about Pelops and Ganymede that have far-reaching significance for Marlowe's description of Leander. The pseudo-Lucianic author

asserts, "one cannot find any humans who've been thought worthy to associate with the gods except for those who've had beauty. For that was why Pelops is said to have shared immortality with the gods, and Ganymede, son of Dardanus, is said to have mastered the highest of all gods so completely that he could not bear to let any of the other gods share his expedition in pursuit of his darling boy . . . ." (477). It is precisely Leander's rare beauty that provokes the narrator to compare him with Pelops and Ganymede.

[13] The phrase from Musaeus, which suggests at least a conceptual parallel with the outcome of Marlowe's digression about Cupid and the Destinies, appears to have gone unnoticed by Roma Gill, who argues that "Cupid's appeal to the Destinies has no counterpart in Musaeus' poem" (Complete Works 299).

[14] Musaeus's Hero and Leander establish a regular pattern of "night-long festals of sleepless wedlock" (line 225). Hero "Was maiden by day, by night a wife; and both lovers / Prayed again and again for the day to go down to setting" (lines 287-88).

[15] Gelzer attributes the verbal similarities between Ovid and Musaeus "to the field of conventional elements in erotic narrative" (305).

[16] See Parker's suggestive point that Renaissance writers link amorous or erotic dilation as a specifically "feminine strategy in the art of love" with the temporal or rhetorical dilation of the text itself ("Literary Fat Ladies" 16-17).

[17] Fowler, like Dubrow, argues that "[i]ndividual *oeuvre* interacts particularly closely with genre. . . . The ideolectal rules of *oeuvre* supplement those of genre in assisting the reader to respond, so that they play a particularly important part in the case of difficult or innovative writers (or writers with a cult reputation)" (128-29).

[18] For a more detailed discussion of the significance of the Phaeton image, which appears in *Edward II* (I.iv.16-17) as well as in *Tamburlaine*, see my fourth chapter.

[19] Cf. Dido's ardent wish to be with *her* beloved, Aeneas: "I'll frame me wings of wax like *Icarus*" (V.i.243).

[20] Gill in her Oxford edition of *Dido* notes Marlowe's self-plagiarism here (299).

[21] Frye defines the tragedy of passion, as opposed to the tragedy of order and the tragedy of isolation, as "a tragedy that deals with the separation of lovers, the conflict of duty and passion, or the conflict of social and personal (sexual or family) interests (*Fools* 16). On the conventional conjunction of love and death in Renaissance

tragedy, see Stilling.

ACT II

"Daring God out of heaven": Tamburlaine's Fortunate Fall

With a bravado that verges on insolence, the Prologue to the first part of Tamburlaine promises a dramatic work of unparalleled grandeur and novelty. The Prologue's eight lines constitute the only substantial authorial guidance the beleaguered readers will receive in their attempts to make meaning of this notoriously ambiguous play. To the barbarous dissonance of contemporary dramatists, those "jigging veins of rhyming mother wits" (1), the Prologue contrasts its own presentation of the "stately" conqueror who amazes with "high astounding terms" (5).[1] The Prologue points not just to the linguistic revolution effected by Marlowe's "mighty line," a revolution which has been well documented by Marlowe scholars, but, even more startlingly, to a generic revolution, which has not received adequate critical attention. Before stepping out of the play for the remainder of Part One, the figure of the Prologue flings out a challenge with regard to the play's tyrant-hero: "View but his picture in this tragic glass, / And then applaud his fortunes as you please" (7-8). As far as authorial guidance goes, these imperatives offer but scant aid. The description of the play as a "tragic glass" raises more questions than it answers, especially for Marlowe's contemporary audience. Into what eccentric tradition of tragedy can the play be assimilated?

At first glance the Prologue, by describing the first part of _Tamburlaine_ as a "tragic glass," appears to situate the play in the mainstream of the native tragic tradition. Yet neither the first nor second part of Marlowe's double-edged, experimental tragedy conforms to _de casibus_ law. The concept of tragedy as a "glass" or "mirror" that reveals universal truths, especially the "truth" that in this world vice is punished and virtue rewarded, is a hallmark of _de casibus_ tragedy, the dominant kind of tragedy in the Renaissance. _De casibus_ tragedy may well be called a "tragedy of power" (Doran 120), since it focusses on portraying the progress and outcome of overweening ambition. Though it resounds with _de casibus_ terminology, _Tamburlaine_--the tragedy of power _par excellence_--clearly resists easy assimilation into this generic strain because Marlowe resolutely refuses to moralize upon his hero's horrifying exploits, and because he delays, unconscionably, the retributive death of his tyrannical hero. Indeed, the Prologue, even while it misleadingly encourages the reading of _Tamburlaine_ as a "tragic glass," hints that Part One will by no means be a conventional tragedy in the _Mirror_ tradition. Rather than the heavy-handed moral guidance typical of _de casibus_ dramatists, Marlowe gives his readers free rein to exercise whatever moral judgments they wish regarding Tamburlaine: "applaud his fortunes as you please." Since Part Two demands, retrospectively, to be read in light of Part One, this chapter treats Tamburlaine as a two-part play, a critical strategy that will serve to underscore Marlowe's immoderate dilation of de casibus law.[2] The Prologue to Part Two, after announcing that Tamburlaine's popularity has brought the sequel into existence, promises a de casibus resolution in which "death cuts off the progress of his [Tamburlaine's] pomp / And murderous Fates throws all his triumphs down" (4-5). However, if the second part of the play gives two clear signs of Tamburlaine's limitation (the death of Zenocrate, and the effeminacy of his son Calyphas), the play also continues to suspend its hero's epic conquests, holding back the retributive forces which conventionally would curtail his overweening ambition. The Prologue to both parts of Tamburlaine thus functions metadramatically--as a pretext--by suggesting the entire play's affiliations with conventional tragedy.

The Prologue, though, does more than provide a metafictional comment on the play's generic status; it focusses on Tamburlaine as the means by which Marlowe ambiguously conveys, and dilates, his tragedy. The key to Marlowe's generic revolution is Tamburlaine himself, an anomaly who overreaches his ancestors in the native tradition. Marlowe decks out Tamburlaine in more heroic colours than the familiar de casibus tyrant, yet never wholly suppresses our awareness of Tamburlaine's most tyrannical bloodthirstiness.[3] Throughout both parts of the play, the reader remains poised not just between these two opposing attitudes towards Tamburlaine--that he is a hero _and_ a tyrant--but between two opposing conceptions of tragedy. With conventions from the dominant strain of _de casibus_ tragedy, Marlowe interweaves the suggestion that Tamburlaine conforms to a different law. The hero seems Herculean, above conventional tragedy's "natural" laws of mutability and retribution. The text's references to Tamburlaine's superhuman qualities have affinities with the copious Renaissance narratives of heroic romance as well as with classical tragedy.[4] By overlaying _de casibus_ tragedy with epic features, Marlowe creates a new strain of heroic tragedy (as witnessed by the conqueror plays that sprang up after _Tamburlaine_).[5] Marlowe's mixture of two kinds in the play produces a generic transformation.[6] In fact, because it inscribes two generic traditions and forces the reader to hesitate between them, _Tamburlaine_ can be seen as a generic revolution that calls into question the very nature of tragedy itself.[7]

i.

From the standpoint of genre, _Tamburlaine_ may well be considered a problem play.[8] Even the earliest descriptions of the play raise puzzling generic questions. The title-page of the first edition sparks the critical controversy when it describes the play as being "Deuided into two Tragicall Discourses." While there is clear validity in calling Tamburlaine as a two-part play a "tragical discourse," the validity of extending the generic judgment of "tragedy" to both parts of the play is questionable. In structural terms, Part Two conforms to tragic convention, for it moves Tamburlaine through a series of confrontations with his human limitations and ends with his death. Part One, however, with its focus on the protagonist's spectacular rise to power and its conventionally comic conclusion in the marriage ceremony, can hardly be considered "tragical." Perhaps it is not mere accident but rather this very recognition that the play contains elements not easily seen as tragic that produced the Stationers' Register reference to Tamburlaine as "twooe commicall discourses" (entry dated August 14, 1590).[9] Taken together, the 1590 title-page and the Stationers' Register entry point to the difficulties inherent in treating Tamburlaine, whose two parts Marlowe wrote separately, as a single play. Even more significantly, these early attempts to label the play throw into relief the eclectic quality of its brand of tragedy.

Readers of this century have similarly disagreed over the genre of Tamburlaine, and their disagreement reflects a fundamental uncertainty over the nature of the protagonist himself. If critics have obeyed the Prologue and applauded the hero as they pleased, their responses reveal a remarkably distinct dichotomy of opinion. Most critics argue either that Tamburlaine serves as an heroic celebration of Renaissance aspiration and achievement or that he embodies a tragic exemplum of the sin and consequences of ambitious pride. Eugene Waith is foremost among those who admiringly cheer Tamburlaine on; Roy Battenhouse instead condemns Tamburlaine's amoral methods of securing power. This polarization of responses to Tamburlaine has by now become a commonplace of Marlowe criticism. What has surprisingly escaped notice is the way in which Waith and Battenhouse, as proponents of the respective positions, appeal to antithetical generic traditions to stake their claims. Each situates the play not just in tragedy but in a specific tragic tradition, whose conventions they argue Marlowe employed to fashion his hero and to shape his audience's responses.

Waith classifies the play as a heroic tragedy, conforming to the conventions of a specific sub-genre that he calls "Herculean tragedy." Battenhouse, on the other hand, because he sees Tamburlaine as the Renaissance type of the bloody tyrant, makes sense of the play by placing it in the entirely different tradition of _de casibus_ tragedy. That Waith and Battenhouse both find textual support for their arguments should alert us to the possibility that the text in fact inscribes conventions from both kinds of tragedy, the de casibus and the heroic. The text seems divided against itself. Its ambiguity embroils the reader in a struggle to name the generic Signified, a struggle which ultimately does not end even with Tamburlaine's death.

This is the pleasure of Marlowe's Tamburlaine: it plays opposing notions of tragedy off against each other in order to create a "tragic glass" quite unlike any his time had before beheld. The "contradictory views of experience" that Marlowe characteristically refuses to resolve (Mulryne and Fender 50) include contradictory views of tragedy itself. Yet, while we may at the outset recognize the limits of a structuralist analysis in containing this kaleidoscopic (even, in deconstructionist terms, aporitic) play, a generic reading offers a valuable way to examine the opposing critical responses. Genre is the technical vehicle that Marlowe uses in Tamburlaine to provoke his reader's ambivalence.

ii.

To give Battenhouse his due, the Mirror or de casibus tradition is indeed crucial for an understanding of Marlowe's play. The Prologue's influential definition of Tamburlaine as a "tragic glass" does partially apply (in a typical Renaissance sense) to the play. Tamburlaine is a virtual anatomy of the falls of princes. And Marlowe certainly begins as Battenhouse wishes, by evoking the expectation that Tamburlaine's career will conform to *de casibus* conventions. Yet the play continually frustrates that expectation by placing Tamburlaine himself above the wheel of Fortune, which conventionally determines the structure of *de casibus* tragedy. Though princes abase themselves around him, mouthing topoi familiar from the *de casibus* tradition, Tamburlaine is never made to moralize upon or repent his vicious ways. He represents something alien to the *de casibus* tradition, a self-possessed romantic hero whose death is virtually earth-shattering. Examining Marlowe's use in *Tamburlaine* of the conventions of *de casibus* tragedy and heroic tragedy will show that the ambiguity so evident in critical responses to the play results from conflicting generic signals. First, however, our discussion of ambiguity in *Tamburlaine* cannot overlook the significance of Marlowe's most basic generic choice: his choice to dramatize the story of Tamburlaine.

Marlowe's choice of the dramatic medium constitutes one good reason why *Tamburlaine* can never entirely fit Battenhouse's description as a "moralized history after the pattern of the *Mirror for Magistrates*." Throughout his dramatic oeuvre, Marlowe chooses to bend the matter of the falls of those in high places to the exigencies of the stage. The dialogical nature of drama allows Marlowe to indulge in what Joel Altman has called "The Tudor Play of Mind," a Renaissance fascination with, and acquired skill for, setting in motion the dialectical play of opposing viewpoints.[10] The Mirror for Magistrates, a compendium of didactic narratives, features a highly intrusive narrator who comments on the falls of the unfortunate princes. That is (to use the narratological distinction familiar from our study of Hero and Leander), the extradiegetic level of the Mirror is crucial to the achievement of its didactic aim. But, as he uses drama rather than narrative fiction in Tamburlaine, Marlowe disperses the conventional moralizing commentary into the mouths of various characters, whose comments compete against each other, especially in the absence of a controlling choric voice.[11]

In drama, what might be called the trace of the author, that controlling voice or hand directing the work's design, surfaces in prologues, prefaces, epilogues, stage-directions, inductions, and dedications (Hernadi 159) but remains for the most part recessed, as the narrator in narrative fiction does not. That any dramatic work entails a dispersal or diffusion (to a greater or lesser extent) of a single controlling viewpoint is an important consideration for Tamburlaine. The play's echoes (often noted by critics) of the narrative sources outlining the famous story of the Scythian conqueror constitute an imitation with significant difference, for in Tamburlaine

Marlowe plays with the moral ambiguity fostered by moving from narrative fiction to drama.

The first part of the play furnishes a particularly cogent example of the ambiguity encouraged by Marlowe's refashioning in dramatic terms of the Tamburlaine myth. After exhibiting the spectacular suicides of Bajazeth and his queen, one of the most celebrated scenes (V.i.213-376) comes to rest in an elegaic moment during which the text professes the very inscrutability of its hero. Despair at Tamburlaine's unbearably dehumanizing treatment has driven both Bajazeth and Zabina to brain themselves against Bajazeth's cage. As Zenocrate's speech makes clear, this most disturbing fall of the Turkish prince and his queen exposes the root of the play's unsettling quality: Tamburlaine the hero, whose unswerving resolution elicits revulsion and awe, because it shows him to be, paradoxically, both inhuman and superhuman. The violent incident, together with Zenocrate's meditations, reveals that the reader's uncertain response towards Tamburlaine stems from the coexistence in the text of two competing notions of tragedy. In the scene, Marlowe makes Zenocrate and Anippe represent opposing views of Tamburlaine: in particular, opposing predictions of Tamburlaine's end. However, Marlowe himself clearly endorses neither view and leaves his readers, in the absence of moral guidance, free to weigh the validity of each stance--to applaud

Tamburlaine's fortunes as they please. If alert to the ambiguous textual cues, we may well find it difficult to choose between Tamburlaine the glory-bound conqueror and Tamburlaine the hell-bound tyrant.

Zenocrate sees the deaths of Bajazeth and Zabina as an emblem in the _de casibus_ tradition. For Zenocrate, the Turks' deaths constitute only one tragic tale among the many "tales of bleeding ruth" (V.i.342) that Tamburlaine has set in motion. The "bloody spectacle" (339) serves her as a violent reminder of the central truth of _de casibus_ tragedy, a truth expressed in terms of the familiar _contemptus mundi_ theme:

> Those that are proud of fickle empery
> And place their chiefest good in earthly pomp,
> Behold the Turk and his great emperess!
> Ah, Tamburlaine, my love, sweet Tamburlaine,
> That fights for scepters and for slippery crowns,
> Behold the Turk and his great emperess!
>
> (V.i.352-57)

Zenocrate reads the falls of Bajazeth and Zabina, "the Turk and his great emperess," as the end of a _de casibus_ narrative, a tale relating the consequences which inevitably ensue when a ruler succumbs to the sin of pride in earthly accomplishments. The Turks' end foreshadows what should be Tamburlaine's end, were he a conventionalized _de casibus_ tyrant.

Zenocrate is moved to draw from the event of the Turks' brainings a moral lesson which she in vain uses to warn Tamburlaine of the consequences of his barbarity. But her maid Anippe, in an effort to assuage Zenocrate's fears, sets Tamburlaine above those moral laws that demand the punishment of vice. In opposition to Zenocrate's charge that Tamburlaine holds "earthly fortune" in contempt, Anippe asserts that he has seized control of Fortune's wheel:

> Madam, content yourself, and be resolv'd
> Your love hath Fortune so at his command
> That she shall stay and turn her wheel no more
> As long as life maintains his mighty arm
> That fights for honor to adorn your head.
> (V.i.372-76)

As indicated by her use of that favourite Tamburlainian word "resolv'd," Anippe's words only second what has been Tamburlaine's position throughout Part One of the play, a position he will scarcely alter in Part Two: that he is mightier than Fortune. Anippe, in other words, believes Tamburlaine's claim that he is not subject to the laws of _de casibus_ tragedy, namely those moral laws which point to Fortune's omnipotence and her relentless impulse to crush proud rulers. While Anippe does not explicitly point to the laws of heroic romance, a Renaissance audience may well place her comment in this generic context, making

Tamburlaine a Herculean hero who subdues Fortune and raises himself above at least many of the usual limitations of Nature.[12] Anippe's speech does recognize that Tamburlaine remains subject to the physical law which dictates the mutability of all earthly things. But how long will Marlowe maintain his hero's "mighty arm"? Remarkably, it is not until the final act of Part Two that "Tamburlaine, the scourge of God, must die" (2.V.iii.248).

The antithetical "readings" of Tamburlaine's behaviour offered by Anippe and Zenocrate reappear in various guises throughout both parts of the play but, as in this passage, are never resolved in a way that makes either position more definitively correct than the other. Zenocrate's case, as it were, may at first seem stronger because she expresses a horror that most readers, not to mention spectators, would share in face of Tamburlaine's cruel, dehumanizing treatment of Bajazeth and Zabina, as well as his pitiless campaign to slaughter the four virgins (V.i.120-31). But Marlowe blunts Zenocrate's _de casibus_ reading of Tamburlaine's brutality by immediately juxtaposing with it Anippe's contrary insistence on Tamburlaine's awe-inspiring heroic power. Anippe's case for Tamburlaine gains considerable counterweight, moreover, because she, not Zenocrate, gets the final word on the subject (Mulryne and Fender 63).

Mulryne and Fender argue that individual responses to the play depend on "whether you choose to believe Zenocrate's or Anippe's interpretation" (64). The two interpretations serve as a neat critical gauge of the stark division in readings of the play: Battenhouse has clearly chosen to believe Zenocrate, and Waith to privilege Anippe's position. Mulryne and Fender do not recognize, though, that what is at stake in this scene, and throughout both parts of the play, is the concept of tragedy itself. Zenocrate and Anippe present antithetical generic views: Zenocrate's is moralized, based on de casibus conventions, while Anippe's transcends morality and focusses on the heroic grandeur of the protagonist. Choosing to side with one or the other character cannot be the ideal strategy of an alert reader. If Mulryne and Fender are correct in arguing that the play, sensitively received, calls forth a response that is not merely ambiguous or dual, but, more accurately, ambivalent, "balanced in uncertainty between opposing attitudes" (64), then the import of this conflict between Zenocrate and Anippe is to call into question, rather than resolve, the fundamental nature of tragedy itself. While the Prologue describes Tamburlaine in deceptively orthodox terms as a "tragic glass," the play insistently opposes a de casibus model of tragedy with a heroic model, thereby throwing into relief the insufficiency of both models to account for the extraordinary nature--and effect--of the hero.

iii.

Marlowe effects the first obvious modification of *de casibus* tragedy in *Tamburlaine* when he retreats from his dramatic creation and forces the reader to become the arbiter of moral judgment. All of Marlowe's appropriations and transformations of *de casibus* tragedy in *Tamburlaine* represent attempts to dismantle the moral fabric of the genre. *De casibus* tragedy tells the story of a ruler or aristocrat puffed up with ambitious pride who learns, and imparts to the reader, the lesson of Fortune: that greatness, and the pride it engenders, precipitate the loss of worldly fortunes. Jonson puts this *de casibus* moral most memorably when in *Sejanus* he translates a famous couplet from Seneca's *Thyestes*: "For whom the morning saw so great, and high, / Thus low, and little, 'fore the even doth lie" (V.902-3). Marlowe himself suggests his intimate familiarity with this Senecan commonplace when he quotes the original Latin in *Edward II*: "*Quem dies vidit veniens superbum*, / *Hunc dies vidit fugiens jacentem*" (IV.vi.53-54). The fallen ruler is Fortune's plaything: once perched atop her wheel, he enjoyed the zenith of her favour, but having since plummeted to the nadir of despair, he is sunk down in social rank and worldly prosperity. The *de casibus* narrative is thus structured according to a rise-and-fall pattern that corresponds in the moral sphere to an emphasis on sin-and-consequences. In English hands, this kind of tragedy often becomes a didactic instrument, which emphasizes the tragic retribution that overtakes the pride-swollen ruler, and frequently ends by stressing the *contemptus mundi* theme. Since the sublunary world, held captive under Fortune's sway, affords only the most precarious and fleeting rewards, especially for those in high places, contempt is the best attitude one can cultivate in face of life's vicissitudes. Human eyes should turn heavenward, not earthward.

If they point to *de casibus* tragedy as a specifically dramatic kind, Renaissance critics also suggest that it is primarily a type of narrative structure with moral implications, which crosses the boundary between dramatic and non-dramatic literature. As implied by its name, *de casibus* tragedy recalls the narrative fiction of Boccaccio, Lydgate, and the *Mirror* authors.[13] Before Marlowe, in fact, the falls of princes receive more treatment in Renaissance non-dramatic literature than on the stage. Sidney, in decrying the indecorous tragedies on the English stage, hints that he is dissatisfied at the absence of *de casibus* tragedy--apart from *Gorboduc*--in the native dramatic tradition.[14]

Recognizable primarily as a moralized narrative structure (whether in *Mirror* literature or in Seneca), *de casibus* tragedy enjoyed such wide popularity in the Renaissance that it gave the educated reader a repertoire of tragic conventions. Indeed, a glance at two of the most celebrated *critici loci* will suffice to show that sixteenth-century English critics who discourse upon the nature of tragedy clearly place foremost tragedy in the *de casibus* vein. Poetry's detractors, especially those who attacked the stage, accused tragedy, the most violent and disturbing of genres, of encouraging tyranny because it exposed the corruption of its aristocratic heroes. In affirming the moral efficacy of tragedy, on the other hand, Renaissance defenders of poetry argued that the "tragedy of power" offered a negative exemplum, no less resolutely didactic for showing that the way *not* to tempt Fortune is to surrender the world under her command.

Sidney, for example, asserts tragedy's capacity to teach contempt of the world. He stresses the monitory power of "high and excellent Tragedy . . . that maketh kings fear to be tyrants, and tyrants manifest their tyrannical humours; that, with stirring the affects of admiration and commiseration, teacheth the uncertainty of this world, and upon how weak foundations gilden roofs are builded" (45). Sidney's emphasis on the "tyrants" that tragedy both inscribes as its heroes and targets as its audience indicates that he is thinking of *de casibus* tragedy, the "tragedy of power." Sidney cites a couplet from Seneca's *Oedipus* that emphasizes the retribution levelled against the tyrant: "*Qui sceptra saevus duro* *imperio regit*, / *Timet timentes*, *metus in auctorem redit*" (45).[15] The major precursors of *de casibus* tragedy for Sidney, as for George Puttenham, appear to be the classical tragedians, not only Seneca but also Euripides and Sophocles (Puttenham 26).

Puttenham, too, in his discussion of tragedy's origins uses traditional *de casibus* language (Farnham 341) and presents power as the central tragic concern. In fact, he establishes a causal link between the emergence of tragedy and the emergence of tyrants.[16] Following the decline of a golden age characterized by classlessness and social equality, Tragedy was born, bringing in its wake a shift of focus onto "mighty and famous" men whose "soueraignetie and dominion . . . learned them all maner of lusts and licentiousnes of life" (Puttenham 33). By means of tragedy, these tyrants' "infamous life and tyrannies were layd open to all the world, their wickednes reproched, their follies and extreme insolencies derided, and their miserable ends painted out in playes and pageants, to shew the mutabilitie of fortune, and the iust punishment of God in reuenge of a vicious and euill life" (33). Puttenham fuses moral elements endemic to both the native and classical traditions of tragedy: the Christian emphasis on tragic retribution is blended (in a fashion typical of English Renaissance writers, without anxiety over the ensuing *contaminatio*) with the classical *contemptus mundi* theme, which stressed the inescapable mutability of Fortune. The "tragedy of power" openly "reproaches" and "derides" the wicked ruler's tyrannies because it invariably pauses to reflect upon the moral lesson provided by his fall.

It is a convention of _de casibus_ tragedy that the unlawful or cruel exercise of power is viewed as the most heinous sin. From its earliest historical "appearance" as a narrative structure--which Chaucer's Monk deems to be the fall of Lucifer--this kind of tragedy teaches its readers to shun ambition by respecting their stations. _De casibus_ tragedy does more than conventionalize the theme of ambition or worldly power; it conventionalizes an _attitude_ towards that theme. By merely invoking the theme of ambition, a Renaissance writer can call forth the reader's expectation that it will be viewed with an attitude of condemnation and horror.

We may isolate three basic philosophical "laws" or principles governing _de casibus_ tragedy, all of which point to the genre's moral emphasis: first, in a tragic universe, retribution overtakes all sinners, especially the ambitious or power-hungry; second, Fortune (often regarded as the servant of divine providence) reigns supreme, and her wily shiftiness can be neither controlled nor eluded; and, third, death is a spiritual as well as a physical fact, leading to self-reflection, repentance, and worldly renunciation. Boccaccio, the initiator of the genre, expresses all three laws in his introduction to the eponymous De Casibus Virorum Illustrium: "from among the mighty I shall select the most famous, so when our princes see these rulers, old and spent, prostrated by the judgment of God, they will recognize God's power, the shiftiness of Fortune, and their own insecurity." In Boccaccio's hands, the abased ruler furnishes a negative example for other magistrates who wield the slippery scepter.

In the English tradition, de casibus tragedy becomes to some extent democratized. The fallen rulers serve as mirrors not just for magistrates but for citizens of every rank who, like their originals Adam and Eve, may be tempted to overstep the bounds of the lawful power assigned them. English practitioners of de casibus tragedy, if they follow Boccaccio in focussing on Fortune's supremacy and the desirability of cultivating an attitude of earthly contempt, insist on the universal application of their lessons. Chaucer's Monk, for example, sees in tragedy a warning of use to all human beings: "Lo, who may truste on Fortune any throwe? / For hym that folweth al this world of prees, / Er he be war, is ofte yleyd ful lowe" (Monk's Tale, lines 2136-78).[17] Though indirect, the Monk's message is clear enough: if Fortune, ruler of the sublunary sphere, prostrates all who lay up for themselves earthly treasure, the wisest policy is to invest only in spiritual, otherworldly goods, to garner treasures in heaven where, in the well-known words of the Gospel, "thieues neither digge through, nor steale" (Matt. 6:20).[18] Regardless of one's rank, this earth affords little protection from the thieving, nefarious ways of Fortune.

Lydgate's seminal de casibus work The Fall of Princes shows that, as the Mirror convention crystallizes in the English tradition, the notion of tragedy's universal applicability becomes more deeply entrenched. Lydgate "Englishes" Boccaccio's collection of de casibus narratives, not merely by translating it into English but, more significantly, by extending it into English history with the addition of new material that concerns itself with native rulers. The Fall of Princes makes the same connection as its generic predecessors between Fortune's gyrations and the need to eschew worldly glory. At the outset of his text, Lydgate reminds his reader that Boccaccio's fallen nobles "fill to putte in remembraunce, / Therin to shew Fortunys variaunce, / That othre myhte as in a merour see / In worldly worshepe may be no surete" (I.53-56). Lydgate openly encourages his reader to find in each narrative, such as the account of Adam and Eve's unfortunate fall, a personally relevant lesson: "Takith exaumpil off Adam and off Eue, / Makith off hem a merour in your mynde" (I.652-53). This tenet that the de casibus protagonist serves the reader as a cautionary "mirror" becomes conventionalized as the continental _de casibus_ tradition takes root and ripens in the hands of English writers.[19] Indeed, so conventionalized is the mirror motif that English _de casibus_ literature has appropriately been called "Mirror literature."

That literature "mirrors" universal truths provides the foundational metaphor of the _Mirror for Magistrates_, the most popular English matrix of _de casibus_ tragedy. In his dedication to the 1559 edition of the _Mirror_, the chief editor and writer William Baldwin makes explicit the motif: "For here as in a loking glas, you shall see (if any vice be in you) howe the like hath bene punished in other heretofore, whereby admonished, I trust it will be a good occasion to move you to the soner amendment" (65-66). As Baldwin's words suggest, the main function of the _de casibus_ mirror is to reveal the punishment of vice. Battenhouse is surely right to characterize the narratives in the _Mirror for Magistrates_ as "moralized histories." The bedrock of _de casibus_ tragedy consists of moral judgments, supplied either by the intrusive narrator or by the personal confessions of the fallen rulers and nobles.

Marlowe's drama not only turns the business of such moral judgments over to the reader but also deliberately frustrates the reader's anticipation that Tamburlaine will eventually confess and gain in the self-knowledge which comes from tragic humiliation. Furthermore, while he subtly inscribes the mirror motif in Tamburlaine, Marlowe postpones, almost until the end of the play's second part, the punishment demanded by his hero's exceptionally monstrous vices. The character of Tamburlaine is thus the kernel in Marlowe's play that bursts the old restrictions of de casibus tragedy. Tamburlaine refuses to circumscribe himself with received tragic notions. He explodes the de casibus laws that dictate the inevitability of tragic retribution, the ineluctable supremacy of Fortune, and the need to cultivate an attitude of repentance and worldly contempt.

iv.

In Tamburlaine, Marlowe evokes de casibus conventions only to transform them radically, with the ultimate end of subverting the genre's moral emphasis. At the linguistic level, the text appropriates and parodies terminology specific to de casibus tragedy. The Prologue's phrase "tragic glass," for example, summons up a de casibus convention that is among the most firmly entrenched in the English tradition. Yet, during the course of the play's two parts, the reader has ample occasion to test the Prologue's use of the Mirror convention. As a designation for a play brimming with vice which goes publicly unrepented and unpunished, the label "tragic glass" is unintelligible in standard de casibus terms.[20] Compared with its conventional usage, the Prologue's label amounts to no more than sardonic mimcry. Tamburlaine is indeed a "tragedy of power," but, in a most unorthodox way, its power-hungry hero seizes centre-stage and never relinquishes the limelight, neither for Fortune nor divine Providence, nor, least of all, for the moral good of society.

Tamburlaine plays with the Mirror convention, most memorably in Act Five, Scene One, which includes both Zenocrate's speech on the vanity of "fickle empery" and "earthly pomp" and Tamburlaine's subsequent speech on his own supposed omnipotence. Zenocrate stresses the visual aspect of Bajazeth and Zabina's horrifying suicides in a way that recalls Mirror literature, whose readers "behold" in the exemplary "mirrors" of magistrates' lives the judgment that befalls the mighty and the proud. Zenocrate's speech has all the earmarks of de casibus tragedy: the insistence on retribution for the sin of pride, the recognition of Fortune's power, and the view of death as a spiritual fact that urges worldly renunciation. In fact, Zenocrate's impassioned prayer for the gods' forgiveness of Tamburlaine not only reveals her fear of tragic retribution but also contains a subtle trope on the conventional de casibus motif known as contemptus mundi:

> Pardon my love! O, pardon his contempt
> Of earthly fortune and respect of pity,

And let not conquest, ruthlessly pursu'd,
Be equally against his life incens'd
In this great Turk and hapless emperess!
(V.i.364-68)

The rebel Tamburlaine instils in those who behold him not contempt of the earth, as would an orthodox _de casibus_ tyrant, but contempt of that "earthly fortune" whose wheel, looming so large in _de casibus_ tragedy, inevitably overturns those who try to mount it.

Tamburlaine's contempt is in large measure directed towards the traditional concept of tragedy, represented by the conventional wheel of Fortune.[21] Indeed, Frye provocatively suggests how this convention may be converted for comic purposes: "The wheel of fortune is a tragic conception, though it is possible to get a technically comic conclusion by stopping the wheel turning halfway" ("Tragedies of Nature" 39). In Marlowe's play, Tamburlaine acts as the agent who for much of the two parts effectively stops the wheel of Fortune from coming full circle to destroy him. Such is the import of Anippe's observation that Tamburlaine "hath Fortune so at his command / That she shall stay and turn her wheel no more." Part One is not, properly speaking, tragic, for Tamburlaine's braking of Fortune's wheel results in that "technically comic conclusion" posited by Frye. Tamburlaine dodges Fortune's hard lesson of earthly contempt precisely because he manages to turn the _de casibus_ tables and hold Fortune herself in contempt.

Zenocrate's thrice-repeated imperative, "Behold the Turk and his great Emperess," may no doubt remind Marlowe's reader of the Prologue's indelible command, the earliest signal of the mirror convention: "View but his picture in this tragic glass." Shortly after Zenocrate's speech, however, we hear an even more unmistakable echo of the _Mirror_ tradition, when Tamburlaine himself openly expresses his contempt of Fortune and his defiance of _de casibus_ laws. His speech responds in several points to the criticisms that Zenocrate has just levelled against him:

> And see, my lord, a sight of strange import,
> Emperors and kings lie breathless at my feet.
> The Turk and his great empress, as it seems,
> Left to themselves while we were at the fight,
> Have desperately dispatch'd their slavish lives;
> With them Arabia too hath left his life;
> All sights of power to grace my victory.
> And such are objects fit for Tamburlaine,
> Wherein, as in a mirror, may be seen
> His honor, that consists in shedding blood
> When men presume to manage arms with him.
>
> (V.i.468-78)

Tamburlaine's panegyric on himself makes mock of Zenocrate's more conventionalized _de casibus_ lament, by echoing her at various points (his command, "see," recalls her injunction, "behold"; he parrots her phrase "The Turk and his great empress"). But, most significantly, in the above passage Tamburlaine distorts the image of the mirror to such an extent that its lineage as a _de casibus_ convention is virtually unrecognizable. The mirror at the end of Part One is not Tamburlaine the tyrant, who in conventional terms should reflect Fortune's invincibility; in a final, startling qualification of the Prologue's promise of a "tragic glass," this last scene of Part One reveals the mirror as all the _other_ prostrate rulers, who themselves reflect only Tamburlaine's invincible, if tyrannical, brand of "honor." "Emperors and kings" lying "breathless" at the feet not of Fortune but of a human being does indeed, if we recall the conventions of _de casibus_ tragedy, constitute "a sight of strange import."[22]

Given the prevailing moralized terms of Renaissance tragedy, Marlowe's generic transformations in _Tamburlaine_ may well be considered a "magnificently insolent dramatic coup" (Nelson 250). Marlowe subverts _de casibus_ conventions not only at the text's linguistic level, as we have seen, but, even more fundamentally, at its structural level. The most recognizable feature of _de casibus_ tragedy is its narrative structure, which describes a predictable rise-and-fall pattern created when the evils perpetrated by the _de casibus_ tyrant inevitably lead to his downfall.

Marlowe, however, postpones for a remarkable period his hero's fall. Tamburlaine's royal triumphs are protracted not merely throughout Part One of the play but, astonishingly, until the end of Part Two, when he finally dies and can conquer no more kingdoms.[23] Marlowe's deferral of Tamburlaine's fall represents an attack on the moral basis of _de casibus_ tragedy.

For his transformation of _de casibus_ tragedy in _Tamburlaine_, Marlowe relies upon a technique similar to the one he uses in _Hero and Leander_: he takes a well-known tragic story and apparently situates it in the context of a moral tradition, only to defer or dilate its expected end. In much the same way as he dilates Musaeus's poem by extending the narrative phase involving the lovers' consummation and aborting the phase involving their deaths, so Marlowe in _Tamburlaine_ dilates the widely known story of the Scythian shepherd by amplifying the protagonist's conquests and suppressing his eventual defeat.

In contrast to his treatment of the Hero and Leander myth, however, Marlowe does not radically alter the narrative structure of the Tamburlaine myth as it was disseminated in the Renaissance. Marlowe's emphasis on both Tamburlaine's mastery of fortune and his undefeated record with his enemies is consonant with well-known Renaissance sources such as Thomas Fortescue's _The Foreste_ (1571), which conjectures that Tamburlaine is the only man who "neuer sawe the back, or frounyng face of fortune" and "neuer was vanquished, or put to flighte by any" (88). Fortescue makes it clear that Tamburlaine eventually falls not through some visitation of divine vengeance but rather through naked mortality: "in the ende this Tamburlaine, though he maintained his estate, in such aucthoritie and honour, yet as a man in the ende, he paieth, the debte due unto nature" (87). The sources present the narrative of Tamburlaine's life as an unbroken line of ascent, sharply opposed to the story-lines of more ordinary tyrants.

The sources place the woeful end of Bajazeth, for example, in some more orthodox tradition of tragedy: "This tragidie might suffice, to withdrawe men, from this transitorie pompe and honour, acquaintyng theimselues with Heauen and with heauenly thinges onely" (Fortescue 85-86). Fortescue appeals to mainstream de casibus tragedy in arguing that Bajazeth ought to serve his readers as a lesson promoting earthly contempt. George Whetstone in The English Myrror (1586), who recounts that "Baiazet . . . in the morning was the mightiest Emperor on earth, at night, and the residue of his life, was driuen to feede among the dogs" (81), indeed recalls Jonson's formulaic statement of de casibus tragedy, with its Thyestean echoes, from Sejanus. For Jonson, as for Seneca, tragedy shows a sunrise king, degraded to a sunset pauper (or worse, a beast). Bajazeth is just such a fragile sunrise king, a de casibus exemplum, for both Whetstone and Fortescue, but neither writer can cast Tamburlaine in this conventional mold. Even in the sources, Tamburlaine threatens to become a moral anomaly, a law unto himself.

In setting this great distance between Tamburlaine and Bajazeth, the sources hint at the ironic possibilities inherent in the Tamburlaine myth. Marlowe either complicates or altogether eschews the sources' moral explanations of the Tamburlaine phenomenon. For the sources do make various attempts to rein in Tamburlaine's aberrant morality. They seek to reconcile Tamburlaine's uncanny ambition and success with their moral imperative to denounce ambitious tyrants.

One of the chief ways contemporary writers attenuate Tamburlaine's unparalleled triumphs in life is to state that after his death his sons, losing his empire, sink his honourable name into ignominious oblivion (Whetstone 82; Fortescue 87). Hence Whetstone makes Tamburlaine suffer punishment--albeit posthumous--for his sins. In _The English Myrror_, the heading of the chapter that recounts Tamburlaine's career emphasizes not only his marvellous exploits but also his eventual downfall, for it promises to narrate "The wonderfull conquest of Tamburlaine, reconquered and his large kingdom ouerthrowne by the enuy and discord of his two sonnes" (80). Along similar lines, Fortescue argues that, in general, no tyrants, even those who seem to minister God's justice, can escape punishment: "Further in this life, God assuredly at sometime dothe punish them, besides that in an other worlde, Hell & damnation is certainely allotted them" (43). Whether or not Fortescue is aware of the contradiction between this professed "law," to which all tyrants are presumably subject, and his own account of the lawless Tamburlaine is unclear. But certainly, that contradiction glares in his text when on the one hand he states that "sutche Mercilesse, and Transubstantiate Monsters, haue died of somme violent, and ignominious deaths" (43-44), only to grant on the other hand that Tamburlaine, having maintained to the end "aucthoritie and honour," experiences by comparison with his victims a peculiarly bloodless death. Fortescue (like Whetstone, though with less conviction) attempts to mete out Tamburlaine's well-deserved punishment by indicating that in time the sons' failure completely erodes Tamburlaine's "remembraunce," "posteritie," and "linage" (87).

Marlowe's own treatment of Tamburlaine's sons typifies his innovative handling of the source material: his play draws out and focusses on the ambiguities and contradictions only implicit in the sources. His hints, much subtler than the sources', of the sons' eventual downfall spotlight not just Tamburlaine's weakness but also, paradoxically, his hero's supreme transcendency.

Marlowe takes pains to suggest that Tamburlaine's sons are made of baser matter than their father: giving his protagonist three sons, where the sources mention only two, Marlowe makes that extra son profess "neither courage, strength, or wit, / But folly, sloth, and damned idleness" (2.IV.i.124-25). In Marlowe's play, Tamburlaine finds his eldest son Calyphas so execrable that he kills him, thus hoping to kill that part of him that tends toward the softer, feminized qualities summed up by Calyphas as "remorse of conscience" (2.IV.i.28).

On the one hand, Tamburlaine's murder of his son points to his own fleshly weakness and hence anticipates his approaching death. Tamburlaine dispatches Calyphas' "fainting soul" (2.IV.i.110) because he deems that soul unworthy to animate the filial body "Whose matter is the flesh of Tamburlaine" (2.IV.i.112). But the murder of Calyphas, a paternal depravity that the watching Orcanes decries as yet another instance of Tamburlaine's "barbarous damned tyranny" (2.IV.i.138), is by no means Tamburlaine's only display of blatant disregard for his own flesh and blood. Earlier, in anger at Calyphas' pacifistic carousing, Tamburlaine does not hesitate to "lance his flesh" by cutting his own arm (2.III.ii.114). Throughout both parts of the play, he denies and tries to eradicate all indications of his share in human weakness, of his own tendency to be "effeminate and faint" (1.V.i.177).

Yet, on the other hand, by killing Calyphas Tamburlaine seems to conquer, at least momentarily, the weaker element in his own nature. Marlowe's creation and subsequent extinction of the character of Calyphas ultimately works to highlight the similarity between Tamburlaine and his other two sons, Amyras and Celebinus. Not only do these surviving sons more closely match Tamburlaine in martial fortitude and the will to conquer, but Marlowe significantly mutes the fact of their future defeat. He may imply a darker future for Tamburlaine's sons, by inserting a few characteristic allusions to Phaeton which suggest the sons' inability to manage their father's dangerous "royal chariot" (2.V.iii.178; cf. 2.V.iii.229-44), but these glances at the "facts" of Tamburlaine's history constitute only the barest trace of his well-known posthumous defeat.

Marlowe uses the extratextual defeat as yet another ironic point of reference to underscore the discrepancy between Tamburlaine and those around him. In the play's final speech, Amyras professes Tamburlaine's absolute unsurpassability: earth and heaven "will equal him no more" (V.iii.253). A Renaissance audience familiar with Fortescue and Whetstone may well have recognized the irony implicit in Marlowe's departure from other contemporary accounts that made explicit the downfall of Tamburlaine's empire after his death. However, it would be wrong to suggest that to evoke the extratextual ending for ironic effect is tantamount to implementing that ending. The effect of Marlowe's Phaeton allusions is to place stress on the sons' incompetence, rather than (as in the sources) on the shame accrued by that incompetence to the father's name. Marlowe provides very little to dim his hero's final glorious apotheosis (Waith 85). Tamburlaine's dying words to his successor Amyras stand uncontested:

> The nature of thy chariot will not bear
> A guide of baser temper than myself,
> More than heaven's coach the pride of Phaeton.
> (2.V.iii.242-44)

Who on earth can manage the chair of Tamburlaine, that "earthly god" (2.I.vi.11) who has proved all other charioteers "of baser temper" than himself?

Marlowe thus effectively expunges the sources' suggestion that Tamburlaine is punished posthumously for his sins. He gives Tamburlaine no retributive sentence other than death itself, whose "wrath and tyranny" (2.V.iii.221)--whether levelled at him or at his beloved Zenocrate--Tamburlaine endures only as all human beings must. For such a "vile tyrant," this "Barbarous, bloody Tamburlaine" (2.V.i.133), the sentence of a death not degrading but finally dignifying, when contrasted to the tyrannical deaths he inflicts on his enemies, seems pale justice indeed. While Marlowe follows the sources in dilating his hero's death, he significantly departs from them by dilating his hero's punishment. Because he keeps the crumbling of Tamburlaine's empire outside the confines of his text, Marlowe even further intensifies Tamburlaine's enigmatic, exceptional nature.

In dilating Tamburlaine's success, Marlowe brings into play a *de casibus* model of tragedy which not only throws into bold relief the singularity of that success but also creates enormous suspense for the tyrant's fall. Marlowe uses two means to raise our expectations of a *de casibus* ending for Tamburlaine. First, he inscribes other *de casibus* narratives within the text and makes the falls of these princes seem cautionary foreshadowings of Tamburlaine's own imminent fall. Second, he intensifies our sense of Tamburlaine's monstrous evils, far beyond the sources' depiction of them.

Tamburlaine exhibits a processional, sequential structure, like its progenitor the myth-play, and its cousin history plays (Frye, *Anatomy* 289), but only with regard to Tamburlaine's own career. The careers of the other kings conform to the entirely different pyramidal structure of *de casibus* tragedy.[24] In sharp contrast to Tamburlaine's steady rise, the rival kings drop off at such regular intervals that all their falls seem to describe the same prototypical *de casibus* narrative, a narrative which the force of the repetition seems to forecast for

Tamburlaine himself. Indeed, many of the accounts of fallen kings, like that of Bajazeth, use de casibus terminology or appeal to de casibus laws. Mycetes seems to be an exception, for although he does fall, he is so ridiculous and verbally impotent that he cannot attain to the dignity of a de casibus end, which would require that "great and thund'ring speech" (1.I.i.3) and deep introspection which he finds patently impossible. The audience can hardly refute Tamburlaine's words to Mycetes: "Thou art no match for mighty Tamburlaine" (1.II.iv.39).

With the entrance of more formidable kings into the play, however, Marlowe's de casibus backdrop becomes highly visible. When he falls, for example, Cosroe recalls the Thyestean formula that the de casibus monarch, though powerful in the morning, is rendered powerless at night:

> Barbarous and bloody Tamburlaine,
> Thus to deprive me of my crown and life!
> Treacherous and false Theridamas,
> Even at the morning of my happy state,
> Scarce being seated in my royal throne,
> To work my downfall and untimely end!
>
> (1.II.vii.1-6)

Cosroe's appeal to the de casibus convention underscores the unmitigated severity of his defeat. Tamburlaine and his henchman Theridamas have so utterly vanquished him that he commands not even the afternoon of power usually granted his fellow _de casibus_ kings.

By contrast, Marlowe structures Bajazeth's career, which Whetstone had also described using the morning-night metaphor, more closely along typical _de casibus_ lines. As does Zenocrate, Bajazeth describes his life in _de casibus_ terms and, on the basis of his own overthrow, predicts the overthrow of Tamburlaine:

> Great Tamburlaine, great in my overthrow,
> Ambitious pride shall make thee fall as low,
> For treading on the back of Bajazeth
> That should be horsed on four mighty kings.
> (1.III.i.27-32)

De casibus logic dictates that, as Bajazeth's pride has gone before his fall, so Tamburlaine's more inordinate pride will usher in an even harder fall. The Soldan of Egypt, Zenocrate's father, yearns with the other subordinate rulers "To tame the pride of this presumptuous beast" (1.IV.iii.15).

Callapine's prediction of Tamburlaine's impending fall emulates the conqueror's oracular style, but to no avail:

> We shall not need to nourish any doubt
> But that proud Fortune, who hath followed long
> The martial sword of mighty Tamburlaine,
> Will now retain her old inconstancy
> And raise our honors to as high a pitch
> In this our strong and fortunate encounter.

(2.III.i.27-32)

Orcanes thunders alongside Callapine that the fight between the Turkish kings and Tamburlaine "Shall end the warlike progress he intends" and send him "headlong to the lake of hell" (2.III.v.23-24). Yet, despite Orcanes' and Callapine's daring prophecies of Tamburlaine's violent end (2.III.v.78), the battle with Tamburlaine proves neither "strong" nor "fortunate" for his opponents. Tamburlaine degrades the kings of Trebizon and Soria to the level of beasts: harnessed to his chariot, they provide his "court" with the debased entertainment of a "pageant" (2.IV.iii.90). The _de casibus_ narrative, controlled indeed (as Callapine suggests) by Fortune's inconstancy, circumscribes other kings but never Tamburlaine himself.

Tamburlaine's accumulated victories only serve to increase his megalomaniac pride, his resolution "To overdare the pride of Graecia" (2.III.v.66), to overdare Jove himself. Always violent, Tamburlaine works up to a frenzied pitch his need to witness his enemies' degradation after Zenocrate's death, and especially in the last two acts of the play. The height of the atrocity comes with Tamburlaine's use of the four kings to draw his chariot.[25] This degradation recalls that of Bajazeth, whom Tamburlaine used as a footstool despite the emperor's protestations that he "should be horsed on four mighty kings."

Tamburlaine's motto may well be "I kill, therefore I am." Mercy and human tenderness denote for him merely lack of "manly" resolution. Not even women and children, who in war are traditionally considered society's innocents, can escape Tamburlaine's murderous force: not the four virgins in Part One who sue, too late, for his mercy with laurel branches in hand, only to be shown tauntingly the point of his sword and then mercilessly speared by four apocalyptically charged horsemen; not Olympia nor her son in Part Two, also hostages of war, who choose to arrange their own deaths rather than risk further torture at the enemy's hands. Tamburlaine's victimization of fellow kings might be excused through the logic of conquest: the encounter with Bajazeth clearly reveals that Tamburlaine only degrades other rulers as they would degrade him, were they triumphant (1.III.iii.75-81). But Marlowe takes pains to emphasize Tamburlaine's ruthlessness. The text often focusses on the pitiable state of Tamburlaine's victims, royalty and commoners alike, by presenting as much of the violence on stage as is dramatically feasible and by allowing those victims to voice their most pathetic misery. The moving speeches of Bajazeth and Zabina in their wretched captivity, followed by their horrifying brainings against the walls of their cage, give us inside knowledge, as do so many other similar episodes in the play, of what it means to be victimized by the tyrant.

Marlowe magnifies Tamburlaine's barbarity from its presentation in the sources. What emerge most clearly in Whetstone and Fortescue are their great admiration and awe for Tamburlaine's success, which they argue he gains because of his rare leadership qualities: respect and generosity towards his followers, and an unswerving regard for justice (Fortescue 84). He can be separated from the bloody tyrants he defeats by virtue not just of his humane, fair leadership but also of his lowly origins. Unlike the proud rulers he brings down from lofty places, he begins life as a common shepherd. Though they mention Tamburlaine's cruelty, Fortescue and Whetstone offer no graphic examples of it except his caging of Bajazeth (which they present as a more notable example of Bajazeth's pride than of Tamburlaine's cruelty) and his slaughter of the Damascan virgins after the symbolic succession of white, red, and black flags. In the sources, as in Marlowe, Tamburlaine emerges almost as a type of the rising middle-class individual so populous in the Renaissance. His earned entry into the ranks of the nobility provokes more sympathetic identification than does the inherited power of those settled tyrants he overthrows.

It is Tamburlaine's violence, his unmitigated need to victimize, that incenses the King of Jerusalem:

> Thy victories are grown so violent
> That shortly heaven, fill'd with the meteors
> Of blood and fire thy tyrannies have made

> Will pour down blood and fire on thy head.
>
> (2.IV.i.139-44)

At this point in the play, perhaps even the audience will agree that Tamburlaine deserves to meet some violent end. Why is Tamburlaine never hoist on his own petard; why do his "Bloody instructions" not return, like Macbeth's, "to plague th'inventor" (Mac. I.vii.9-10)?

Fortescue offers, by way of explanation for Tamburlaine's evasion of divine punishment, the principle that "all sutche cruell and incarnate Deuils, are instruments wherewith God chastiseth sinne" (43). Whetstone agrees that God only permits Tamburlaine's cruelty as a means to scourge wicked rulers: "TAMBERLAIN although he was endued with many excellencies & vertues: yet it seemed by his cruelty, that God raysed him to chasten the kings & proud people of the earth" (82). But Marlowe cannot develop the idea that Tamburlaine is the scourge of God without problematizing it. His Tamburlaine is certainly a scourge for proud princes, but the God Tamburlaine serves is unrecognizable by standard measures of Christian propriety.[26]

Marlowe's play complicates the concept of tragedy by complicating the concept of God. For example, in Zenocrate's prayer entreating divine pardon for Tamburlaine's sins, while he exploits several de casibus conventions, Marlowe subtly modifies the genre by confounding the familiar monotheistic conception of the *de casibus* God. Zenocrate calls out not to a secure Judeo-Christian deity but rather, ambiguously, to "mighty Jove and holy Mahomet" (1.V.i.363). The blurring of moral and religious categories noticeable in Zenocrate's speech intensifies as the play progresses, so much so that in Part Two the nebulousness of the concept of God becomes a major theme.

The play refuses to explain away Tamburlaine's cruelty by putting it in the service of a politically active deity. Neither Christ not Mahomet definitively controls the world of the play, as the changeable fortunes of Sigismund, the Christian King of Hungary, and Orcanes, the Muslim King of Natolia, make clear. Though both kings swear by their gods to maintain a truce, Sigismund breaks his Christian oath. After his army suffers sudden defeat at Orcanes' hands, Sigismund dies, repenting his sin and attributing his downfall to Christ's avenging power. Thus far the action of the play can be naturalized by appealing to the conventional Renaissance logic of tragedy, which stresses that sin cannot escape divine vengeance. At first even the heathen Orcanes, believing Christ controlled Sigismund's defeat, commits his own coming battle with Tamburlaine into Christ's hands: "If there be Christ, we shall have victory" (2.II.ii.64). But Orcanes and his troops succumb to Tamburlaine's greater power. Where Sigismund's defeat seemed to indicate Christ's power, Orcanes' defeat again calls that power into question.

Marlowe deliberately problematizes the whole _de casibus_ notion of divine vengeance for sin. The kings who initially swear that Tamburlaine will suffer such vengeance are made to recant their claims, based on _de casibus_ assumptions. Just as Bajazeth in Part One of the play finally confesses Tamburlaine's matchless power (V.i.229-33), so Callapine in Part Two admits at last,

> . . . the force of Tamburlaine is great,
> His fortune greater, and the victories
> Wherewith he hath so sore dismay'd the world
> Are greatest to discourage all our drifts.
> (V.ii.42-45)

Tamburlaine himself finally burns the Koran in defiance of Mahomet's avenging power, a gesture that suggests he is ready to do battle with a god. Tamburlaine invites Mahomet's punishment for his countless atrocities against Muslims, especially his latest atrocity, the wholesale murder of all Babylonians--"man, woman, and child" (2.V.i.168). Calling him down from heaven to "work a miracle" (2.V.i.186), Tamburlaine dares Mahomet to stop his bloody progress. He voices the question that has reverberated throughout the play, the quesion prompted by a consideration of the many _de casibus_ narratives of other princes who have fallen around him: why is he alone immune to divine vengeance, though he dares follow slaughter with sacrilege?

> Why send'st thou not a furious whirlwind down
> To blow thy Alcoran up to thy throne,
> Where men report thou sitt'st by God himself?
> Or vengeance on the head of Tamburlaine
> That shakes his sword against thy majesty
> And spurns the abstracts of thy foolish laws?
> (2.V.i.190-95)

Confronting Mahomet's silence towards his transgressions leads Tamburlaine to equivocate on the very concept of God:

> Seek out another godhead to adore--
> The God that sits in heaven, if any god,
> For He is God alone, and none but He.
> (2.V.i.198-200)

The most frightening thing about this God ("if any god") that seems to control the world of the play--a god inscrutable, because uncircumscribed by familiar religious laws--is that a human being, equally inscrutable and lawless, can claim to be his scourge.

The action of the play complicates the question of divine vengeance still further when Tamburlaine feels suddenly "distempered" (2.V.ii.216) a few short lines after daring Mahomet out of heaven. Neither Tamburlaine nor Techelles can locate a specific cause of the "distemper" (2.V.ii.217-18), and even the enemy Callapine reflects this uncertainty in his tentative anticipation of a victory that might "so revenge our latest grievous loss, / If God or Mahomet send any aid" (2.V.ii.10-11). This confusion of tragic causality is one of Marlowe's most daring modifications of de casibus convention. Callapine calls out once more to "sacred Mahomet":

> Aid thy obedient servant, Callapine,
> And make him after all these overthrows
> To triumph over cursed Tamburlaine.
>
> (2.V.ii.27-30)

If the text here obliquely alludes to Callapine's historical triumph over Tamburlaine's sons, it is apparently Mahomet who directs the final victory in the fates of the characters. To attribute, even in a hypothetical literary realm, historical power to the God not of Christianity but rather of Islam seems a particularly daring stroke for a Renaissance writer, bound legally if not morally to keep in place the sanctioned Christian ideology. In order to unsettle the contemporary concept of tragedy, Marlowe unsettles the very God that conventionally directs that genre. Tamburlaine's fall cannot with certainty be attributed directly to either Christ or Mahomet. In Marlowe's play, the notion of Tamburlaine as God's scourge, which the sources exploited precisely as a means to uphold Renaissance ideology, instead only magnifies the difficult moral questions that underlie the de casibus genre.

In order to call into question the central de casibus principle of divine punishment for sin, Marlowe makes Tamburlaine's evasion of that punishment even more unthinkable by piling up his acts of violence and placing them continually before our eyes. In converting Tamburlaine's story from page to stage, Marlowe uses his dramatic resources to maximum advantage. The dramatic medium by its very nature emphasizes spectacle, achieving its unique power through visual appeal. The spectacular force of Tamburlaine accords with the Prologue's insistence that we view Tamburlaine's picture in "this tragic glass." We see "as in a mirror" Tamburlaine's perverted "honor, that consists in shedding blood" (1.V.i.476-77). Marlowe uses Tamburlaine's "sights of power" to evoke revulsion for the protagonist's tyrannical qualities.

Conversely, Marlowe uses the other essential component of drama, its aural emphasis, to provoke admiration for the protagonist's heroic qualities. Though he descends to the depths of human degradation with his violence, Tamburlaine also soars above the "highest reaches" of art through the beauty of poetry. After he gives the order to slaughter the Damascan virgins, Tamburlaine abruptly turns his thoughts towards poetry, in a soliloquy which is among the play's most lyrically haunting passages. Critics have shown that the effect of this abrupt switch from

Tamburlaine's violence to his capacity for poetry is to complicate our response towards the tyrant-hero.[27] But what has largely escaped notice is the way Marlowe, by making the play represent yet another kind of mirror, accomplishes a further, brilliant transformation of _de casibus_ tragedy. Tamburlaine, who "Must needs have beauty beat on his conceits" (1.V.i.182), laments the ultimate inexpressibility of beauty; but his speech in effect panegyrizes the "immortal flowers of poesy / Wherein as in a mirror we perceive / The highest reaches of a human wit" (1.V.i.166-68). Poetry like Marlowe's does capture beauty, albeit incompletely. The text pits poetry's aesthetic "mirror," which transcends morality, against the moral mirror held up by _de casibus_ tragedy. Hence, just as Tamburlaine shows himself most violent, the play tends to wax most lyrical, and vice versa. Another way of saying this is that, in _Tamburlaine_, the "language of romance" (Martin) works at cross-purposes with the tragic material. It is hardly surprising, given Marlowe's design to provoke the reader's ambivalence, that Tamburlaine's view of his bloody conquests as a "mirror" for his "honor" comes only shortly after his encomium on poetry--in the same scene, in fact.

The text's lyrical beauty detaches Tamburlaine's most arrogant ambition from its conventionally associated attitude of moral disapproval. The magnificent rhetoric of the shepherd-born conqueror makes climbing beyond one's station laudable, not reprehensible. Tamburlaine's famous speech on human aspiration (1.II.vii.12-29) ascends to such poetic heights that at first we may ignore just how subversive its message looks when viewed against the backdrop of _de casibus_ tragedy. Instead of curbing his overreaching zeal by reference to a conventional God who demands respect of stations, Tamburlaine finds his "precedent" for overreaching in "mighty Jove" (1.II.vii.17). If even Jove could "thrust his doting father [Saturn] from his chair" (1.II.vii.14), who can censure Tamburlaine for thrusting out Cosroe, or Mycetes, or the countless kings whom he had to conquer in order to obtain and maintain royal power? Tamburlaine's speech might well have sounded a chord of pride in a Renaissance audience, whose society indeed aspired to "comprehend / The wondrous architecture of the world / And measure every wand'ring planet's course" (21-23).[28] Exploiting the "mirror" of poetry throughout both parts of the play allows Marlowe to gain approval for a tyrant who by conventional _de casibus_ standards should have suffered swift, divine punishment.

v.

"Tragedy," says Frye, "is a mixture of the heroic and the ironic" ("Tragedies of Nature" 44). In order to accomplish what we might call his amoral dilation of *de casibus* tragedy in *Tamburlaine*, Marlowe focusses on the heroic phase of tragedy, where the hero seems to control the wheel of Fortune, rather than on the ironic phase, where Fortune instead abases and controls the hero. Marlowe gives Tamburlaine control of Fortune's wheel, thus delaying the essentially ironic movement of *de casibus* tragedy. Until his death, the audience may in fact become tempted to believe Tamburlaine's boast, despite its human emanation, that he possesses godlike power:

> I hold the Fates bound fast in iron chains,
> And with my hand turn Fortune's wheel about,
> And sooner shall the sun fall from his sphere
> Than Tamburlaine be slain or overcome.
>
> (1.I.ii.174-77)

Like his favourite disciple Theridamas, whose early wooing by Tamburlaine (1.I.ii) mirrors our own involuntary attraction to the tyrant, we find in the play's events ample confirmation that Tamburlaine "treadeth fortune underneath his feet" (2.III.iv.52).

Don Allen Cameron argues that in creating a protagonist who is Fortune's master, Marlowe exploits a Renaissance convention that effectively overturns its contrary in the *de casibus* tradition. Citing Machiavelli and Guicciardini, Cameron indicates that several prominent Renaissance writers "proposed the theory that a clever man was able to take advantage of fortune" (189), but it is Pontano's thesis of the _fortunatus_ or fortunate man, guided by his own impulses as well as by the stars and "agitated by a divine power" (192), that is most useful to a discussion of _Tamburlaine_. In a conventional tragedy, lightning inevitably strikes a hubristic hero, defiant of Fortune's power. In _Tamburlaine_, "the reason for the dilatoriness of the lightning" may well be, as Cameron asserts, "that Marlowe conceived Tamburlaine to be one of the _fortunati_" (193).

Waith similarly focusses on Marlowe's use of conventionalized features in Renaissance literature to underscore Tamburlaine's heroism. Perhaps the greatest merit of Waith's argument that Hercules (as disseminated in the plays of Sophocles, Euripides, and Seneca) "was often in Marlowe's mind as he wrote" _Tamburlaine_ (63) lies in his careful recognition that "Marlowe's method of constructing his dramatic portrait is essentially dialectical" (70). Marlowe's depiction of Tamburlaine's virtually superhuman cruelty is for Waith "one of the chief occasions for wonder: one may disapprove and yet, in that special sense, admire" (70). Waith indicates, as I have done from a different point of departure, the way the text emphasizes Tamburlaine's heroic nature. However, Waith fails to consider the way the text pits more solidified tragic conventions against such an "extravagantly unconventional protagonist" (60). Significantly, in his dealings with the gods Tamburlaine indeed "has the assurance of a demigod rather than the piety of a good man" (Waith 84); yet we can scarcely account for the shocking fascination that his pretensions to godhead hold for us, without using as a moral and intellectual point of reference the more highly conventionalized tradition of de casibus tragedy which the play both evokes and ultimately overreaches.

Marlowe's play repeatedly returns to the exceptional, inscrutable nature of its hero. He seems indeed a "monster turned to a manly shape" (1.II.vi.16), compounded of the "angry seeds" of "powers divine, or else infernal," but at any rate a being "never sprung of human race" (1.II.vi.9-11). Small wonder that death is the only enemy strong enough to conquer Tamburlaine. In his earthly progress, Marlowe's hero advances on the very gates of Babylon itself. His feat suggests a typological parallel with Christ's apocalptic victory over the world of sin and death, symbolized in Revelation as Babylon in the figure of a whore. And, while it finally proves him human, Tamburlaine's death could almost be seen as affording him a final chance to realize his countless boasts to ascend to heaven and take on Jove himself. Marlowe makes his autochthonous hero seem the son not of "poore, and neeedie" parents (Fortescue 83) but of Jove. As suggested by his persistent references to the usurping-son myth in classical mythology, Tamburlaine as Jove's son cannot help but aspire to Jove's power. After all, Jove, "the eldest son of heavenly Ops," instinctively usurped the place of his own father, Saturn. Using his usurping triumphs to link himself to Jove, Tamburlaine hints at his own competition with the god whose scourge he claims to be:

> Then in my coach, like Saturn's royal son
> Mounted his shining chariot gilt with fire,
> And drawn with princely eagles through the path
> Pav'd with bright crystal and enchas'd with stars,
> When all the gods stand gazing at his pomp,
> So will I ride through Samarcanda streets,
> Until my soul, dissevered from this flesh,
> Shall mount the milk-white way and meet Him there.
> (2.IV.iii.125-32)

Although Jove seems to offer a more equal match for Tamburlaine than any of the earthly kings, too soon fallen, whose places he has usurped, there is also a sense in which Tamburlaine serves as an emblem of "Clymene's brainsick son" (2.V.iii.231), by means of which we "learn with awful eye, / To sway a throne as dangerous as his" (2.V.iii.234-35).

At a metafictional level, the metaphor of the usurping son aptly describes Marlowe's relation to his sources and to his generic predecessors. The Prologue encourages this metafictional extension by putting forth the play as a revolutionary advance on previous works of its kind. The Prologue's representation of contemporary dramatic attempts, with their "jigging veins of rhyming mother wits / And such conceits as clownage keeps in pay" (1-2), realls not just Mycetes' bumbling couplets but also, perhaps, the moralized _sententiae_ of _Mirror_ literature. Against what the play presents as an effete moral tradition, Marlowe (like his protagonist) sets the "high astounding terms" (5) of an heroic tradition whose conventions (_pace_ Waith) will not begin to crystallize until Dryden pens "Of Heroic Tragedy" and Romantic writers collectively validate the genre. If Greene condemns Marlowe for "daring God out of heaven with that Atheist Tamburlaine," there can be little doubt that _Tamburlaine_ was in its time highly esteemed and wondered at (Richard Levin). And, whatever his own personal convictions, Marlowe does produce in _Tamburlaine_ a play that in provoking profound ambivalence for its hero dares the idols of the _de casibus_ marketplace--the conventions of the genre--out of their settled haven.

Notes

[1] All quotations from the two parts of Tamburlaine are taken from Jump's edition in the Regents Renaissance Drama series.

[2] In assuming a unity between the two parts of Tamburlaine, I follow critics such as Harry Levin; Steane; and Waith, Herculean Hero. In his discussion of the Elizabethan two-part play, Hunter points out that Marlowe unifies the two parts of Tamburlaine, as Shakespeare unifies Henry IV, by means of "a parallel setting-out of the incidents" in both parts (243). Leech, however, treats each part of the play, especially Part Two, as a unified whole ("Structure").

[3] Tamburlaine's ability to provoke ambivalent responses in the audience exemplifies Marlowe's ironic strategy throughout his drama: as Weil shows, Marlowe manipulates our conflicting awareness both of the moral failing of his heroes and their compelling heroic energy.

[4] See Waith's study of "the Herculean hero," the "warrior of great stature who is guilty of striking departures from the morality of the society in which he lives" (11). Examining several such heroes from the late sixteenth through the seventeenth century, Waith argues, "it is significant that they move in a territory shared by two genres, epic and tragedy" (12). The attitude of English dramatists towards Hercules, whom classical writers

celebrated in both epic and tragic forms, "owes something to both genres" (12).

[5] Among the most important successors to Tamburlaine are Alphonsus, King of Aragon (1587), by Marlowe's fellow "University Wit," Robert Greene; and the anonymous Selimus (1591), also possibly by Greene, who "appears to have been more conscious than any of the other imitators of Marlowe that the Tamburlainean conqueror posed ethical and dramaturgical problems" (Berek 72). See Berek's excellent summary of the ten plays "performed in England between 1587 and 1593" which "show clear debts to Tamburlaine" (58).

[6] According to his chapter on "Mode and Subgenre," Fowler might refer to Marlowe's use of epic features to characterize Tamburlaine as a modal transformation. Fowler argues, "when a modal term is linked with the name of a kind, it refers to a combined genre, in which the overall form is determined by the kind alone" (107). If we treat the two parts of the play as a whole, we may call Tamburlaine a heroic tragedy: the external form is tragic (the hero dies), but the adjective suggests "that some of the nonstructural features of a kind [in this case epic] are extended to modify another kind" (Fowler 107). The first part of Tamburlaine, taken alone, seems more completely to mix two distinct kinds, de casibus tragedy and epic romance, since the hero does not in fact die. Fowler's comment that "There is seldom room, except by a

special tour de force, for two external forms in a single work" (107), need not, of course, exclude our consideration of Marlowe's own dramatic tour de force as a generic transformation. Furthermore, it will be less confusing to speak of generic than modal transformations in Marlowe, since I use Frye's theory of the "modes" of tragedy (referring to the hero's degree of power over his environment and in relation to the audience [Anatomy 33-67]) as a useful way of classifying Marlowe's experiments in the genre (see my fourth chapter).

[7] Frye in the Anatomy calls Tamburlaine a "secular auto" (283), a descendant of the scriptural play or "myth-play," which "emphasizes dramatically the symbol of spiritual and corporeal communion" (282). Frye argues that Tamburlaine is "a romantic drama presenting the exploits of a hero, which is closely related to tragedy, the end of a hero's exploit being eventually his death, but which in itself is neither tragic nor comic, being primarily spectacular" (283). Frye's brief discussion hints that Tamburlaine is an originator of this most experimental secularization of a pre-existing genre, its nearest thriving cousin being the Elizabethan history play (283). For a summary of the place of Tamburlaine in Frye's theory of specific dramatic forms, see A. C. Hamilton 172.

[8] Generic studies often link Tamburlaine with Shakespeare's Henry V. For a discussion of Henry V as a problem play, see chapter 4 of Jonathan Hart's book Theater and World.

[9] Several comic scenes also appear to have been excised from the printed text: the printer Richard Jones, in his preface to the first edition of the two parts of Tamburlaine (1590), confesses to having "purposely omitted and left out some fond and frivolous gestures, digressing and, in my poor opinion, far unmeet for the matter. . . ." (Ribner, Complete Plays 50). Cf. Steane 106.

[10] See Altman's final chapter, "'If Words Might Serve,' Marlowe's Supposes," which argues that Marlowe's dialectically structured tragedies finally demonstrate the human impossibility of grasping ultimate reality.

[11] Several critics see Zenocrate as the choric voice in the play, a "moral touchstone" (Alter 330) or "emissary of our common morality" (Fanta 16). But Martin recognizes the full force of Marlowe's ambiguity and more persuasively shows that the play as a whole rejects Zenocrate's moral reading: "The beliefs inherent in her speech fail to gather any rhetorical momentum in the play, and this failure convinces us of the inadequacy of a tragic world view in judging the world of romance" (249).

[12] See Richard Levin's argument, based on extant contemporary responses to Tamburlaine, that Marlowe's hero as intended to evoke the audience's wonder or admiration . . . . There is no suggestion that any of these authors saw the play as an admonitory lesson on the failure or defeat of ambition or pride or anything else" (55). Such a collectively positive response is consonant with Marlowe's sources: "Infinite ambition, inordinate lust of dominion, and unbounded belief in his own victorious destiny are . . . outstanding qualities in the sixteenth-century conception of Tamburlaine, not products of Marlowe's invention" (Spence 605).

[13] Lily B. Campbell indicates the dissociation of tragedy from the drama "until well after the middle of the sixteenth century" and shows that "the most far-reaching influence of the Mirror for Magistrates came through the fact that it acted as the bridge by which medieval tragedy crossed over into the literature of the Renaissance" (Tudor 16). For other valuable discussions of the origins of de casibus tragedy, see Campbell, Slaves 3-24; Cole, Suffering 42-49; Farnham; and Margeson 71-82. Margeson also notes that "Tamburlaine I . . . is the reversal of all that the traditional theme [of Mirror and Senecan tragedy] had made familiar and expected" (104).

[14] See Sidney's Defence of Poetry: "Our tragedies and comedies (not without cause cried out against),observ[e] rules neither of honest civility nor skilful poetry--excepting Gorboduc (again, I say, of those I have seen), which . . . is full of stately speeches and well-sounding phrases, climbing to the height of Seneca's style, and as full of notable morality, which it doth most delightfully teach, and so obtain the very end of poesy" (65).

[15] Kimbrough translates the couplet as follows: "He who rules his people with a harsh government fears those who fear him; the fear returns upon its author" (129). Marlowe's Barabas echoes this retributive logic when he confesses to the audience, "I now am governor of Malta. True, / But Malta hates me, and in hating me / My life's in danger" (V.ii.29-31). Nonetheless, in The Jew of Malta, as my fifth chapter shows, Marlowe plays as defiantly with de casibus conventionas he does in Tamburlaine.

[16] Bushnell's stimulating study examines the link between tyranny, tragedy, and hypocrisy: "The tyrant is identified with the tragic actor both because he personifies the violence and cruelty that is tragedy's essence and because his nature is fundamentally histrionic" (7).

[17] Chaucer's famous definition of tragedy as a narrative structure typifies the medieval and Renaissance use of the term to characterize both non-dramatic and

dramatic works that conform to this structure. Furthermore, Chaucer explicitly places the Monk's compendium of tragic narratives from Lucifer to Cresus in the de casibus tradition: "Heere bigynneth the Monkes Tale De Casibus Virorum Illustrium" (189).

[18] I cite the Geneva Bible throughout my thesis, as the edition most familiar and accessible to Marlowe as well as to Shakespeare (see Sims and Cornelius).

[19] The dramatic appropriation of specific Mirror conventions is exemplified by Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's early Jocasta (1566), whose marginal glosses uphold Oedipus's suffering and fall as "A mirrour for Magistrates," and whose epilogue condemns the "high-aspiring minde" (qtd. in Cole 59). Cole also points to two other pre-Marlovian plays pervaded by "retributive urgency": Gorboduc (1561/62) and Gismond of Salerne (1567/68).

[20] Ribner in "Marlowe's 'Tragicke Glasse'" similarly posits that Tamburlaine's death stems not from a divine retributive force but rather from the natural, "inscrutable force" of death, which claims all individuals (96).

[21] For discussions of Fortune's central importance in medieval and Renaissance tragedy, see Patch and Kiefer.

[22] Thurn shows the importance of "sights of power" as a means for Tamburlaine "to constitute and verify the spectacle of his triumph" (14) and argues that Marlowe's

play "exhibits a distinct interest in the power of fictions to 'place things before the eyes,' to makes things visible, alive, actual" (13). See also Birringer's discussion of the spectacular features in Tamburlaine, which Marlowe uses to confuse us and "unsettl[e] our expectations" ("Marlowe's Violent Stage" 229).

[23] See Nelson's argument that Marlowe in Part Two achieves "an even more surprising coup than he had achieved in Part I: his presentation of Tamburlaine's death turns out to be, not the anticipated homily on the transience of worldly prosperity but a crowning panegyric in dramatic form on the departing and still triumphant conqueror" (251).

[24] See Harry Levin's appendix on Marlowe's plots, with its helpful comparisons to Shakespeare, facilitated by graphs of the plots of Tamburlaine, The Jew of Malta, and Edward II (187-89). As Levin notes, "Edward II, for all its complications," is closest to "the traditional pattern" (187).

[25] Marlowe's presentation of Tamburlaine riding a chariot horsed by four kings, like Lodge's similar presentation of Scilla in a chariot drawn by four Moors, harkens back to previous conventional depictions of Fortune in her chariot, namely in Gascoigne and Kinwelmershe's Jocasta (1966) and in The Contention Between Liberality and Prodigality (c. 1567; publ. 1602): see Kiefer 129. On the emblematic or iconographical significance of Tamburlaine's

chariot, see also Chew, Cockcroft, and Powell.

[26] Birringer argues that Tamburlaine "continuously shapes and reshapes the concept of godhead, creating, as it were, the God, whose 'Scourge' he claims to be, in his own image" (234), so that the "shadow of divine retribution . . . [is] transformed into a testing ground for his supreme self-esteem" ("Marlowe's Violent Stage" 234). Palmer agrees that "The play shows us the conditions under which men variously interpret the will of their gods, and how they attribute adivine authority to their own desires and fears" (169). Tamburlaine emphasizes this creation of a self-serving God far more than it does any "passionate involvement with the idea of God's purity and transcendence" on Marlowe's part (Hunter, "Theology" 100).

[27] Steane points out that the passage on the "immortall flowers of Poesy" rises to religious heights, and "combines three articles of Tamburlaine's creed: reverence for beauty, pride in man, and aspiration seen as an essential part of natural living" (113). The encomium to Poetry recalls the earlier passage on the aspiring soul, "Still climbing after knowledge infinite": since that passage "is given Tamburlaine at a point where conventional morality condemns him its effect must be to afford a protection against the hostility of that morality" (Steane 97). Ellis-Fermor also emphasizes the play's lyrical beauty, conveyed through its hero: Tamburlaine "is a poem

chariot, see also Chew, Cockcroft, and Powell.

[26] Birringer argues that Tamburlaine "continuously shapes and reshapes the concept of godhead, creating, as it were, the God, whose 'Scourge' he claims to be, in his own image" (234), so that the "shadow of divine retribution . . . [is] transformed into a testing ground for his supreme self-esteem" ("Marlowe's Violent Stage" 234). Palmer agrees that "The play shows us the conditions under which men variously interpret the will of their gods, and how they attribute adivine authority to their own desires and fears" (169). Tamburlaine emphasizes this creation of a self-serving God far more than it does any "passionate involvement with the idea of God's purity and transcendence" on Marlowe's part (Hunter, "Theology" 100).

[27] Steane points out that the passage on the "immortall flowers of Poesy" rises to religious heights, and "combines three articles of Tamburlaine's creed: reverence for beauty, pride in man, and aspiration seen as an essential part of natural living" (113). The encomium to Poetry recalls the earlier passage on the aspiring soul, "Still climbing after knowledge infinite": since that passage "is given Tamburlaine at a point where conventional morality condemns him its effect must be to afford a protection against the hostility of that morality" (Steane 97). Ellis-Fermor also emphasizes the play's lyrical beauty, conveyed through its hero: Tamburlaine "is a poem

in which the thwarted instinct for beauty finds its outlet . . . with a delirious rapture that raised it far above the lyric power of his contemporaries" (25). See also Martin.

[28] Hallett Smith argues that, far from writing a morality play, Marlowe has Tamburlaine embody the spirit of the Renaissance. If in Loys LeRoy's La Vicissitude ou Variete des Choses en l'Univers (1575), Tamburlaine serves as the man of the epoch, his strivings represent "a respectable Renaissance idea" (Hallett Smith, "Tamburlaine" 126).

ACT III

"Striving Tongues": The Play of Linguistic Authority in Dido and Dr. Faustus

Marlowe's adaptation of Musaeus and Ovid in Hero and Leander shows how a Renaissance writer can openly echo and pay homage to his literary forefathers while radically transforming and striving against them. By keeping uppermost in his reader's mind the lovers' impending fall, Marlowe concedes the precedence of the "divine Musaeus," author of Hero and Leander's original tragedy. At the same time, however, Marlowe overlays Musaeus with a characteristically Renaissance blend of self-conscious comic irony that derives from Ovid. Marlowe rewrites Musaeus to ensure that Hero and Leander enjoy their uninterrupted night of passion, at least during what we might regard as the "night-space" of the poem. Becoming a type of Jove himself, Marlowe decisively holds back the "horses of the night" that would usher in the tragic moment, represented in the poem as a blinding day of order, reason, and law.[1]

If in Hero and Leander Marlowe skews Musaeus's tragic narrative in the direction of comedy, affording his lovers a "comic dilation," in Dido he skews Virgil's Latin epic in the direction of vernacular drama, allowing Dido and Aeneas a kind of "vernacular dilation," until tragedy finally dictates the triumph of the original text. Faustus similarly is allowed a playful dilatory space, in which he is free to usurp liturgical authority by parodying sacred words, until at last these words destroy him. All tragedy ends with a triumph of authority--in Frye's words, with "an epiphany of law, of that which is and must be" (Anatomy 208). The tragic law that eventually overrides Dido and Faustus, despite their heroic rebellion,[2] is represented in the plays by what was for the Renaissance the prominent language of authority, Latin. Surprisingly, no one has examined the way Marlowe's tragic heroes wage their struggle against authority at the most fundamental level of language. In Dido and Dr. Faustus, the struggle between the heroes and the law that will destroy them--a struggle that lies at the heart of all tragedy--is figured forth in a linguistic struggle between the vernacular and Latin.[3]

We may well suspect that Marlowe uses Dido, Aeneas, and Faustus to offer an overtly metafictional comment on his own relation to his literary sources. At the extradiegetic level of both plays (at the level of narration), we perceive Marlowe wrestling with a prior authoritative discourse; at the diegetic level, Dido and Aeneas, as well as Faustus, struggle both to insert themselves into and to wrench themselves free of an analogous authoritative discourse. Thus, for example, in Dido, his dramatic translation of Virgil's Aeneid, Marlowe alternates at times between direct, faithful, and apparently reverent translation (even quotation) of his source, and a free retelling of the episode in contemporary Renaissance terms that parody the voice and intention of the original.[4] And Marlowe underscores his own ambivalent relationship to Virgil--his conflict between presenting the distanced context of the classical Latin and the more familiar context of his own Renaissance vernacular--by making his protagonists Dido and Aeneas confront the original text: they mouth the Latin lines of the source even as they admit that these lines are not heart-felt. Marlowe brings Faustus, too, into direct contact with written (or printed) authority. It is, in part, Faustus's fascination with "heavenly words," his obsession with the incantatory power of liturgical ritual, that damns him.[5] As he seals his pact with the devil by parodying the sacred words of Christ on the cross, Faustus spells his own destruction. He tries to overreach both the devil and heavenly authority; what is not often recognized is that Marlowe represents this authority as Latin writing.

In both Dido and Dr. Faustus, Marlowe uses two languages to represent two opposing conceptual horizons, what Rosalie Colie (to recall her famous treatment of Renaissance genres) might call two distinct "frames" or "fixes" on the world (8). In the English Renaissance, Latin and the vernacular, far from being neutral or innocent languages, are "ideologically saturated" (Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination 271). The Renaissance is characterized by a clash of ideologies, a clash between the formerly more unified, settled world-view of the Middle Ages and the diversified, unsettled world-view of the more progressive age of humanism. A key Renaissance controversy centres on the authority of Latin versus that of the vernacular: Latin signifies for many Renaissance writers and readers the old literary or linguistic order, in opposition to the new order heralded by the vernacular.

While Latin in general functions as the foremost language of authority in Renaissance England, precision demands that we may speak not of one Latin but of several "Latins." Marlowe in several of his plays makes Latin the sign of the tragic law that destroys his heroes; in the specific context of each play, however, Latin becomes encoded differently, or invested with various (though still conventional) Renaissance meanings. The use of Latin in Dido, for example, can best be understood as Marlowe's employment of the "Virgilian code," to borrow Jan Kott's phrase (108).[6] The conclusive use of Latin in Dido signals the victory of the epic forces of (public) history over the dilatory impulse of (private) romance. Through the use of Latin throughout Dr. Faustus, on the other hand, Marlowe establishes what we might call, more broadly, a "scholastic code," equally familiar to Marlowe's audience or readership.[7] Unlike Aeneas, Faustus is not confined to a single classical author who can be made to stand for a definite ideology. Rather, Faustus pits himself against multiple classical authorities, representing various humanistic disciplines. Entering the play as invisible voices, these scholarly authorities reveal Faustus's conflict, not with a particular ideology but with scholastic authority in general. Faustus splits apart the old world-order represented by classical Latin, setting in its place his own words, his individualistic version of reality. Though both Faustus and Dido (the latter to a lesser extent) try to gain authority and power through appropriating Latin as an authoritative discourse, their attempts are doomed to failure. Marlowe shows his participation in the contemporary debate over linguistic authority by conveying the tragic struggle between authority and the individual as a struggle between Latin and the vernacular.

i.

If all of Marlowe's tragic protagonists are, to recall Harry Levin's famous argument, "overreachers," what they struggle for and against is linguistic authority.[8] Each of Marlowe's six tragedies is built around an overreaching character of such central importance that its name provides the play's title, with the apparent exception of The

Massacre at Paris.[9] Each of Marlowe's overreacher-heroes attempts to usurp the power of established authority, a project which is nicely encapsulated in the choric epilogue to Dr. Faustus: Faustus exemplifies the Marlovian aspiring mind whose deep fall may "exhort the wise / Only to wonder at unlawful things," but also, ironically, "doth entice such forward wits / To practise more than heavenly power permits" (7-8).[10]

Marlowe undoubtedly gives the classical figures Icarus and Phaeton such a prominent place in his corpus precisely because they represent so clearly the aspiring (yet earth-bound) hero who seeks to "practise more than heavenly power permits."[11] With remarkable frequency, Marlowe makes use of this figure of the rebel son who heroically tries, but tragically fails, to override the command of his powerful father. Icarus, escaping with his father Daedalus from a life of imprisonment, manages flight with the help of wings made of wax; but, because he ignores his father's command to avoid flying too close to the sun, Icarus melts his wings and plummets to a watery death. Phaeton similarly aspires to unlawful power: he asks his father Apollo, the sun-god, to permit him to drive the sun's chariot across the sky. Phaeton ignores his father's impassioned warnings against the folly of this attempt to reach towards the sun's power. Unable to manage the powerful horses that drive the sun's chariot, Phaeton, like Icarus, plummets earth-ward, to a watery death.

Marlowe has such frequent recourse to the myth of Icarus/Phaeton that the figure of the rebel son becomes a distinguishing landmark on the horizon of Marlowe's private mythology. The rebel son comes to symbolize for Marlowe's readerly public the Renaissance writer's own iconoclasm, his rebellion against established authority. And the rebel-son myth has an additional, unrecognized layer of significance for Marlowe's tragic heroes: they, like Icarus and Phaeton, rebel against the "word of the fathers." As he shapes the myth to suit his own tragically ironic purposes, Marlowe depicts the son's rebellion against the powerful father as a discursive--that is, linguistically waged--battle. Manifesting his own rebellion against his literary forefathers with the aid not of "waxen wings" but a "mighty line,"[12] Marlowe shows his tragic protagonists fighting a similar battle through language.

Both Dido and Faustus rebel against the "word of the fathers": Dido against Jupiter's edict that Aeneas leave her to resume his martial vocation (specifically, to found Rome); and Faustus against the power (similarly heavenly, but institutionalized through the printed word) that dictates the Christian path of duty he should follow. Not surprisingly, Marlowe compares both Dido and Faustus to Icarus, a familiar Renaissance type of willfulness and ambition who appears not only in Renaissance emblem-books but also in the Mirror for Magistrates and Preston's Cambises (Cole 196-97n12).[13] Insofar as they overtly rebel against a powerful authority, Dido and Faustus can be seen as types of the rebel son, although, as we shall see, Dido the queen ultimately fits the son-role less surely than she does the role of another, decidedly less glorified, Marlovian rebel-figure, the seductive mother who sets herself against patriarchal values (Kuriyama, Hammer 53).

However, at the end of the play, as she voices her desire to follow Aeneas and dissuade him from obeying his heavenly father Jupiter, Dido ironically compares her efforts to those of Icarus. Because Aeneas has taken her entire fleet, Dido cannot follow him without overcoming the elements, as did "Tritons neece," or Icarus. Dido sees her Icarian attempts to usurp heavenly power as already defeated, but she nonetheless thinks, heroically, of making a virtue of defeat: "Ile frame me wings of waxe like Icarus. / And ore his ships will soare unto the Sunne, / That they may melt and I fall in his armes" (V.i.243-5). Flying after Aeneas, Dido might escape Icarus's defeat if the melting of her wings could expel her not into the surging ocean but into "his armes." However, in this final scene, Dido is indeed defeated by the power of a symbolic "Sunne," Jupiter. In keeping with the Icarus allusion, she consumes herself in fire and offers herself as a "private Sacrifize" (V.i.286). Thus she attempts both to make

Aeneas "famous through the world, / For perjurie and slaughter of a Queene" (V.i.293-4) and "to cure [her] minde that melts for unkind love" (V.i.287).

Faustus suffers a "hellish fall" that is also consonant with the Icarus allusion because it seems to involve being consumed by fire, in this case the fires of hell. In his midnight hour, Faustus is heard to "shriek and call aloud for help, / At which self time the house seem'd all on fire / With dreadful horror of these damned fiends" (xx.10-12). It is not enough that Faustus in his closing soliloquy vows, "I'll burn my books!" (xix.190); he himself must be literally consumed by the passion that he has chosen. Faustus's "hellish fall" has of course been foreshadowed as early as the choric prologue to the play. The Chorus uses the myth of Icarus, tellingly, to describe Faustus's progress in education: "swollen with cunning of a self-conceit, / His waxen wings did mount above his reach, / And, melting, heavens conspir'd his overthrow" (Prol. 20-22). As in Dido, the allusion to Icarus is here permeated with a heavy tragic irony, since Faustus has already fallen when the play begins. His "waxen wings" of humanist education do make his reach exceed his grasp, for he, like Icarus, cannot keep within the bounds enjoined by such ultimately tenuous wings.

While Icarus serves Marlowe as a master metaphor to embody the individual's rebellion against authority, in its fullest outlines the Icarus myth also upholds the eternally privileged position of the father's word. Both Aeneas and Faustus are types of the prodigal son (although Faustus' tragedy is that he, unlike Aeneas, cannot return to the open-armed father). Marlowe presents both characters' wandering away from the father as a vernacular wandering away from classical (Latin) authority. Faustus remains "resolute" throughout the play in speaking a filial language sharply opposed to the paternal language of authority. However, Aeneas learns (as an epic hero must) to speak the authoritative language of the father. Aeneas's narrative culminates in the victory of the patriarchal tradition, and hence relies precisely upon just such a worthy, willing son who takes on the goals of the father to become himself a "founding father."

Dido's relation to paternal authority, and hence to the authoritative word, is more complicated. Dido shares in the son's rebellion but, when seen from Aeneas's perspective, she represents a language more diametrically opposed to that of Jupiter. She sets what Marlowe portrays as the "word of the mother" against Jupiter's paternal command. In Dido as in Dr. Faustus, the titular hero opposes the word of the father but is eventually defeated by that authoritative word. As they attempt to "translate" this word or command into their own terms, both heroes manage a "vernacular dilation" of the conventional narrative prescribed by the authoritative word. The remainder of this chapter details this "vernacular dilation" that is so central to understanding the nature of the tragic conflict in _Dido_ (which merits an especially close reading because critics have too often ignored it) and in _Dr. Faustus_ (which, as Marlowe's most thoroughly discussed play, can withstand a broader overview). But in order to understand Marlowe's conventional use of Latin-as-law in these two tragedies, we need first to sketch the sociopolitical associations of Latin to a Renaissance mind.

ii.

In making Latin the sign of the tragic "law" that destroys his protagonists, Marlowe implements a kind of semiotic code that not only would have had profound significance for him as a Renaissance writer but also would have been familiar to his original audience and readership. As a canonized language of authority in Renaissance England, Latin was perceived as a kind of parental, even paternal, tongue against which the vernacular tongue was learned and understood. The great age of translation, the English Renaissance has an agonistic relationship with the prior authoritative literature of the classics (whose "rebirth" or _renascentia_ gives the age its name). On the one hand, Marlowe's age shows a pervasive reliance upon, and indeed preoccupation with, classical literature, especially Latin; on the other hand, the age evinces an ever-growing confidence in the superiority of its own language and literature that in fact ultimately sets the English literary tradition on solid footing. And certainly the controversies begun in the Middle Ages over the authority of Latin versus that of the vernacular continued to rage even in the 1580s, when Marlowe embarked on his writing career. In 1588, Richard Mulcaster obviously feels pressure from opponents who continue to advocate the ascendancy of Latin over the vernacular, because he feels moved to protest, "I honour the Latin, but I worship the English" (qtd. in Thompson 25). Mulcaster is of course caught in a compromised position: personally, he may "worship the English," but his post as headmaster of the famous Merchant Taylors school in London ensures that, professionally at least, he will actively promote and "honour" the Latin. Marlowe's own grammar-school roots and Cambridge University background, both of which laid considerable stress on Latin as the language (and literature) *par excellence*, suggest that his early training as a writer placed him in a similarly compromised position.

It was only by imitation of the Latin classics (and, to a lesser extent, of the Greek) that writers in Renaissance England could by degrees rise to competence in their own language. A typical Renaissance boy was immersed from his earliest schooldays in Latin grammar, via canonical classical authors. A Renaissance writer would thus have gained an intimate childhood acquaintance with significant authors such as Erasmus, Terence, Plautus, Cicero, Horace, Lucan, Ovid, and Virgil. Sister Miriam Joseph summarizes well the project of a typical Tudor grammar-school: "The aim of the grammar-school curriculum was to enable the student to read, write, and speak Latin, to acquaint him with the leading Latin classics and a few of the Greek, and to infuse into him sound moral and religious principles" (8). By stages, a boy advanced from memorizing the grammatical rules set out in Latin grammar-texts such as Lily's, to recognizing these constructions while reading and analyzing classical authors, and finally to making his own translations of English into Latin. Once a pupil translated a dictated English passage (which might be either the teacher's own English translation of a Latin passage, or a passage from the English Bible), the Latin rendering could then be tested against the original text. As if to impress the superior value of the Latin more surely on the English boy's memory, the reputedly best tutors often accomplished the teaching of their lessons with the help of vigorous beatings. Hence the primacy of classical language and literature, notably Latin, was quite literally beaten into the heads of Renaissance writers.

Learning that Latin was the written standard by which their English compositions must be measured, Renaissance schoolboys adopted a kind of schizophrenic attitude not only to writing but also to speaking their own native tongue. School regulations routinely specified that boys must at all times speak Latin on school-grounds, even during periods of play. Indeed, Latin--above English--was a means to securing power in the realm of Renaissance politics. Both a living tongue and the dead language of the Vulgate, Latin served Marlowe, and many a Renaissance male, as a "passport to official life" (Brown 10). Ascham's confession in The Scholemaster (1570) that "all men couet to haue their children speake latin" (2) indicates the perceived importance of Latin as an instrument used by the middle class in their efforts to rise in social stature. However, for Ascham's deceptively neutral generic term "children," we may read "boys," since the learning of Latin in grammar-school, as well as the entrance into civil service it made possible, remained an exclusively male province.

The Latin training of Renaissance writers has profound implications for the study of Marlowe's work, especially when we recognize that Marlowe's immersion in classical authors continued and intensified as he studied for his Master of Arts at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. As a schoolboy, Marlowe would no doubt have performed in Latin plays, written either by Terence or Plautus, or composed by the resident schoolmaster, and usually performed during school holidays (especially at Christmas and just before Lent). Marlowe's exposure to Latin drama would only have increased at Cambridge University, a well-known enclave of Senecan drama. It was in fact at the universities, Oxford as well as Cambridge, that the most learned species of Renaissance drama took root, first in performances of Latin classics, then in English translations of these classics, and only later in the writing and performance of English drama. In the development of its drama, Renaissance England remarkably recapitulated as a nation what its individual writers had learned in grammar-school: original composition followed only after the mastery of strict translation and imitation of the classics.

Marlowe in turn, not surprisingly, seems to begin his writing career as a translator. And, even at the end of his career, Latin continues to surface as an almost physical presence in his plays, suggesting the extent to which his thought and development as a writer have been shaped by his contact with this other, authoritative language and literature. In the Renaissance, writerly invention is understood in its rhetorical sense as a new arrangement of what has been previously known, rather than (in the sense it later acquires in the Romantic era) as an original discovery of the yet unknown: hence all forms of writing to a Renaissance mind appear in the light of "translation," since even "original" compositions in the vernacular invariably refer back to a prior narrative source.

In the intriguing preface to his translation of Montaigne (1603), John Florio offers an apology for translation, directed towards those who hold "that such conversion is the subversion of Universities" (7). Setting up translation as the proper province of "Schollers" (7), Florio implies that all interpretation is a form of translation, especially since all writing is imitation:

> If nothing can be now sayd, but hath beene saide before . . . if there be no new thing under the Sunne . . . . What doe the best then, but gleane after others harvest? borrow their colours, inherite their possessions? What do they but translate? perhaps, usurpe? (8-9)

Florio's notion of translation (or, implicitly, interpretation) as a kind of usurpation provides an important Renaissance context for our understanding of Marlowe's, and indeed Faustus's, relation to classical texts.

Yet, if Marlowe as Renaissance writer cannot be said to exhibit the intense "anxiety of influence" that Harold Bloom attributes to Romantic writers--because Marlowe acknowledges and accepts his close relationship with his sources--he does show a kind of ambivalence towards these sources.[14] Indeed, as Brian Duffy points out, this ambivalent attitude is inherent in the very exercise of Renaissance translation: "Translation, the method by which the vernaculars are most often tested against the expressive power of the classical languages, is at once a recognition of the superior position of the antecedent literary culture and a refusal to capitulate to it" (27). Though schoolmasters might train their pupils to revere their classical forefathers almost with the same breath as they exhorted them to observe the fifth commandment, their own ambivalent attitude towards classical authority is suggested by the powerfully strong drive in Renaissance England to establish a vernacular tradition that would surpass the Latin. Marlowe himself is of course a prominent pioneer in this effort to overreach the literature of the classics.

Marlowe's editors have speculated, sometimes in widely divergent directions, on the dating of his works. But, given his strenuous training in translation while at Cambridge, it is conceivably there that Marlowe began his earliest works, the almost verbatim translations of Book One of Lucan's Pharsalia, and All Ovids Elegies.[15] Dido, Marlowe's dramatic "translation" of Book IV of Virgil's Aeneid, also seems to belong to his Cambridge period: this play seems logically to follow and advance the translations of Lucan and Ovid, since it involves Marlowe's freer adaptation of his sources.[16]

In the first volume of the recent Oxford edition of Marlowe's works, editor Roma Gill arranges his four major "translations" in just this convincing order of composition: All Ovids Elegies; Lucans First Booke; Dido Queene of Carthage; Hero and Leander. Gill's introduction further elaborates on this suggested order by using Dryden's distinction between three methods of translation. In All Ovids Elegies and Lucans First Booke, according to Gill, Marlowe uses the translation method that Dryden calls "metaphrase," or direct, word-for-word rendering of one language into another; in Dido he uses what Dryden calls "paraphrase, or translation with latitude" (xiii), a method which amplifies but does not definitively alter the original source. Gill sees Hero and Leander as Marlowe's last work, written during 1592-93, just before Marlowe's death (perhaps during closure of the theatres during the plague months). Claiming that Hero and Leander can be considered a "translation" only if we use Dryden's third sense of translation as "imitation," Gill quotes Dryden's definition of "imitation":

> I take imitation of an author. . . to be an endeavour of a later poet to write like one who has written before him, on the same subject; that is, not to translate his words, or to be confined to his sense, but only to set him as a pattern, and to write as he supposes that author

> would have done, had he lived in our age and in our country.
>
> (qtd. in *Complete Works* xiv)

Yet Dryden's definition here aptly describes not only the relation of Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* to its classical source but also, though to a lesser degree, the relation of *Dido* to its source in Virgil's *Aeneid*. For Marlowe also contemporizes Virgil's epic in the terms of Renaissance drama, adapting the myth in the direction Virgil himself might have taken, had he been a Renaissance Englishman. Unlike a strict translation in the vein of *All Ovids Elegies* or *Lucans First Booke*, *Dido* does not confine itself to the intention of its original source.

Nor are the four works included in Gill's Oxford edition the only ones in Marlowe's canon to involve translation. In both *Dr. Faustus* and *Edward II*, the tragic hero is in a very real sense killed by Latin, or rather by the inherent perplexities of translation. Latin becomes a sign of death in *Edward II*, from Mortimer's hubristic Machiavellian assertion (which also serves as an ironic anticipation of his inevitable fall) that he is too great for Fortune to harm--"*major sum quam cui possit fortuna nocere*" (V.iv.69)--to the motto that Lancaster bears on his shield, signifying that death is on all sides--"*Undique mors est*." Most importantly, the ambiguous Latin letter that Mortimer sends Edward's captor provides the effectual means of assassination.[17] By its very ambiguity, the letter shields Mortimer and his accomplices from being identified and prosecuted for the murder. Although the message, "*Edwardum occidere nolite timere bonum est*" (V.iv.8), "Unpointed as it is" (V.iv.13), might be read in a way which either justifies or forbids the killing of the king, Mortimer knows that its meaning depends on the receiver, the devilish Lightborn, who will read (that is, translate) it as Mortimer's intended command to assassinate Edward. If Edward's death comes at the hands of the Latin "letter," Faustus's fall similarly might be called a "tragedy of mistranslation." As we shall see, Marlowe transfers his own project of translation as a Renaissance writer to Faustus, but he presents his hero as an inept reader or "translator" of classical texts. Translation is a form of reading (as Faustus's opening soliloquy shows) because it too involves interpretation, choices between differing significations of a single word. Faustus misinterprets the privileged Word of his society. While in *Dr. Faustus* he moves translation towards outright parody of the scholastic tradition, in *Dido* Marlowe also accomplishes a complex and often overlooked parody of Virgil that must be recognized in order to grasp the Marlovian encoding of linguistic authority.

iii.

Marlowe's *Dido* retells the story (narrated in Books I, II, and IV of Virgil's Aeneid) of Aeneas's momentary deferral of his epic role as he succumbs to Dido's passion. Aeneas delays his quest as a warrior-hero, lapsing into self-forgetful effeminacy, until Jupiter summons him to fulfill his divinely ordained vocation to establish Rome. Marlowe's play represents not a straight translation but a parodic re-working of his source in Virgil. First of all, as his title suggests, Marlowe skews the focus of Virgil's epic by centering not on the traditionally male epic hero but instead on Dido. Virgil only hints at Dido's resistance to Jupiter's authority and her power to deter Aeneas; Marlowe, on the other hand, makes Dido a real oppositional force that must be reckoned with. Furthermore, Marlowe's Aeneas becomes the object of a clear discursive conflict between Jupiter and Dido. Aeneas's hesitation between the claims of epic and those of romance provides Marlowe with the material for his main plot rather than, as in Virgil, with a mere plot-digression. Thus Marlowe dilates or amplifies Virgil's romantic episode involving Dido and Aeneas, developing into a complete five-act play what originally constitutes only a subordinate episode in Virgil's epic.

Not only does Marlowe dilate the episode from Virgil and focus more squarely on the woman's part, but he also, even more significantly, undercuts the authoritative, unified voice that characterizes Virgil's epic. In

Virgil's text, the voice of the narrator seems authoritative, or "authorized," because it brooks no serious contradiction: it harmonizes with the voice of the gods, who shape history, and that of the hero, who follows the gods' commands. As a dramatic adaptation, however, Marlowe's Dido not only recesses the controlling, authoritative voice of the epic narrator, but also undermines the authority of the god Jupiter, who conveys the epic "word of the father." Marlowe retains Jupiter as a character in his play, but strips this character of its former dignity and effectual power. Marlowe further undermines Jupiter's (and, by extension, Virgil's) authority by heightening the resistance of both Aeneas and Dido to obeying the god's command.

Marlowe's Dido infuses the monologism of Virgil's epic with a thoroughgoing dialogism. In the manner of a translator, Marlowe not only encloses his version of Virgil in invisible quotation marks, but also superimposes on this quotation of his reverent literary forefather an unmistakably parodic tone. Of course, drama has the capacity to parody the authoritative nature of epic precisely because it can contemporize the sacred context of the distanced epic past. Bakhtin offers a useful starting-point for a discussion of the difference between the monologic (or single-voiced and authoritative) form of the epic, and the dialogic (or double-voiced and polysemous) form of drama. Though Bakhtin attributes it to the novel, the "dialogical principle"--a parodic, carnivalesque, deconstructive tendency--may be applied even more appropriately to the drama.[18] _Pace_ Bakhtin, it is not the novel that properly should lay claim to deconstructing the monologism of the epic: it is drama in performance that portrays a truly concrete and living reality. Drama (the real "word-made-flesh") embodies the carnivalesque spirit, emphasizing what Bakhtin himself calls "material sensual experience"; drama, too, undercuts the novel's single-voiced, monological authorial position with a meaning that must remain dialogically constituted (Wise 16-20).

Although his assumptions need modification in the light of more recent advances in genre theory, Bakhtin remains highly useful for a discussion of the way in which a carnivalesque drama such as Marlowe's _Dido_ "translates" an epic such as Virgil's _Aeneid_. In fact, in treating the transformation of a traditional, authoritative genre effected by a popular, carnivalesque genre, Bakhtin himself uses the analogy of translating a foreign language:

> When verbal disciplines are taught in school, two basic modes are recognized for the appropriation and transmission--simultaneously--of another's words (a text, a rule, a model): 'reciting by heart' and 'retelling in one's own words.'"
>
> (341)

To parrot "authoritative discourse," as the epic does, is akin to straightforward translation, "reciting by heart"; to adapt freely this hieratic word in favour of an "internally persuasive discourse," as does the novel (and drama, to advance Bakhtin even further), is akin to "retelling in one's own words."

Bakhtin's postulate of the mutually exclusive categories of "authoritative discourse" and "internally persuasive discourse" illuminates the relation to authority not only of Marlowe but also of his tragic protagonists. In the process of parodically "translating" Virgil's epic into the terms of English Renaissance drama, Marlowe has his created characters themselves debate and dilate the authoritative discourse of the epic, embodied in Jupiter's word. Virgil's _Aeneid_, and Jupiter's command (as Virgil portrays it), correspond well with Bakhtin's definition of authoritative discourse:

> The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already _acknowledged_ in the past. It is a _prior_ discourse. (342)

Authoritative discourse "demands our unconditional allegiance," can only be either wholly accepted or wholly rejected, and "permits no play with the context framing it"

(Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination 343). But, precisely because he plays with its framing context (and allows Aeneas and Dido to play with it, too), Marlowe scoffs at Virgil's authoritative discourse, represented in the play by Jupiter's compelling word.

However, if Marlowe's vernacular dilation of Virgil in several important ways overrides Virgil's authoritative text, Dido also ultimately upholds the ascendancy of the source. Dido no more changes the shape of Aeneas's story than Marlowe changes Virgil's basic narrative structure: each accomplishes a dilation only, a short-lived resistance to the authoritative discourse that dictates the shape of future events. Certainly, Dido for a time stems the tide of duty, suspending Aeneas's epic narrative with a digressive romantic interlude. Yet with her dying words she must submit to the gods' authority which she has so long resisted. And, when Marlowe has Dido and Aeneas in their parting scene recite virtually word for word the original lines from Virgil's Aeneid, he suggests the extent to which he and his created lovers remain bound to the authority of Virgil's prior word. But Marlowe's direct echo of Virgil at the end of the play must be seen as "double-voiced" (Bakhtin, Dialogic Imagination 324). Because Marlowe's play has contemporized Virgil's epic in the terms of Renaissance drama, and undermined in various ways the authority of the source, Marlowe's final parroting of the original carries the marks of Marlowe's own parodic concerns.

Marlowe undermines the authority of Jupiter's word by dialogizing both the transmission and reception of this word. To begin with, Marlowe's opening scene has the effect of enclosing the entire "translation" of Virgil in what Bakhtin would call "cheerfully irreverent quotation marks" (55), for it parodies the pious distance from which the gods are viewed in the epic. Marlowe's gods may remain the force that controls and foresees human destiny: at the end of the play it is clearly Jupiter who dictates the fate of Dido and Aeneas, and Marlowe stresses the god's authority by using the hieratic, fixed (that is, "dead") language of classical Latin. But in the opening scene, as he translates Virgil into the contemporary terms of Renaissance England, Marlowe presents the gods as childish, petulant, appetite-bound creatures whose words (once translated into the vernacular) can be easily challenged.

Jupiter's opening words, in which he professes his infatuation for Ganimed, set the tone of the entire play by making this heavenly father look ridiculous and undignified: "Come gentle Ganimed and play with me, / I love thee well, say Juno what she will" (1-2). This first line of Marlowe's play, while it represents the word of the father, immediately juxtaposes with that word the counter-discourse of Juno. Jupiter claims to overrule Juno ("say

Juno what she will"), but Marlowe emphasizes the strength of her resistance.

In fact, Ganimed scorns Jupiter's love as "worthless" because it "will not shield [him] from [Juno's] shrewish blowes" (I.i.3-4). She has boxed his ears until they bled. Jupiter, enraged that Juno "dares . . . strike the darling of [his] thoughts," vows to punish any subsequent provocations by hanging "her meteor like twixt heaven and earth, . . . / As once [he] did for harming _Hercules_" (I.i.12-15). Just as Juno had attempted to shipwreck Hercules, the prototypical warrior-hero, she now is attempting to shipwreck Aeneas. Venus, entering shortly after the scene between Jupiter and Ganimed, to plead for Jupiter's aid in bringing Aeneas and his shipmates safe to shore, in fact singles out "_Juno_, false _Juno_ in her Chariots pompe" (I.i.54) as the cause of the stormy seas that threaten to destroy Aeneas and his crew. Juno's attempted destruction of Hercules--like Ganimed, the "darling of [Jupiter's] thought"--is thus recapitulated in Juno's attempted destruction of Aeneas, who is also destined to become Jupiter's preferred "darling." As Jupiter, Ganimed, and Venus all unanimously point out, Juno is the force that opposes Jupiter and the epic heroes related to him.

In strengthening the opposition to Jupiter's authority, Marlowe draws a parallel between Dido and Juno.

In the Aeneid (I.15-16), Virgil states that Juno loves Carthage even more than Samos, her birthplace; Aeneas is a force to be expunged because, according to prophecy, his Trojan race will one day destroy Carthage. Marlowe similarly stresses Juno's desire to protect Carthage, and her connection with Dido in this regard. Aeneas himself links the power of Dido and Juno when he vows "Never to leave these newe upreared walles, / Whiles Dido lives and rules in Junos towne, / Never to like or love any but her" (III.iv.43-51). The ambiguous reference for the final pronoun here implicitly links Dido and Juno: at first Aeneas chooses a dilatory path less in keeping with Jupiter's than with Juno's (and Dido's) goals: he will become "The King of Carthage, not Anchises sonne" (III.iv.60) and hence keep the power of Carthage, "Junos towne," intact.

The opening scene of Dido establishes a triangular contest between Jupiter, Ganimed, and Juno that is mirrored at the diegetic level by the contest between Dido, Aeneas, and Jupiter. Just as Juno attempts to thwart Jupiter's passion for Ganimed, so Jupiter later in the play intervenes in Dido's love for Aeneas. Thus Marlowe connects Dido not only with Juno, who represents on the divine plane the chief opposition to Jupiter, but also with Jupiter himself. This analogy between Jupiter and Dido reinforces even more significantly the parodic nature of

Marlowe's adaptation of Virgil. Although Jupiter in his role as history-maker and epic authority finally opposes his word to Dido's, suppressing her word as surely as Juno's in the opening scene, Marlowe ironically begins the play by showing that Jupiter exhibits passionate inclinations analogous to Dido's own. Marlowe explicitly compares the means Dido uses to capture Aeneas to those used by Jupiter to secure Ganimed's affections. Jupiter bribes Ganimed by giving him the "linked gems / . . . Juno ware upon her marriage day" (I.i.42-43); Dido similarly gives Aeneas garments and jewellery from her late husband Sicheus: "Hold, take these Jewels at thy Lovers hand, / These golden bracelets, and this wedding ring, / Wherewith my husband woo'd me yet a maide" (III.iv.61-64). Dido also recalls Jupiter's bribery of Ganimed when she baits Aeneas, "Ile repaire thy Troian ships, / Conditionally that thou wilt stay with me" (III.i.113-14).

Bribery provides both Jupiter and Dido a way to detain their beloved and hence to dilate their passion. As Dido is willing to surrender all her royal power to Aeneas, so Jupiter admits that he can deny Ganimed nothing:

> What ist sweet wagge I should deny thy youth?
> Whose face reflects such pleasure to mine eyes,
> As I exhal'd with thy fire darting beames,
> Have oft driven backe the horses of the night,
> When as they would have hal'd thee from my sight. . .

(I.i.23-7)

Marlowe (like Ovid, not Virgil) shows his Jupiter in possession of dilatory powers that make him the envy of all lovers: in order to prolong his pleasure with Ganimed, Marlowe's Jupiter has successfully stopped the horses of the night from drawing the sun's chariot across the sky--not once, as in Ovid, but "oft." When Dido herself later succumbs to Cupid's power, she too wishes to suspend time, to dilate the historical narrative which would hale Aeneas from her sight.

Marlowe's dalliance between Jupiter and Ganimed, an addition to Virgil's original, is the chief means by which he parodies the god's privileged epic position. Ganimed not only openly defies and scorns Jupiter's words but is manifestly in control of this purportedly highest god. After Ganimed denounces Jupiter's love for him as "worthless," Jupiter only rewards Ganimed's insolence by giving him power: "Controule proud Fate, and cut the thred of time, / Why, are not all the Gods at thy commaund, / And heaven and earth the bounds of thy delight?" (I.i.29-31). Marlowe's rhetorical use of the word "Why" echoes his habitual practice elsewhere (Fehrenbach 1468-71). If Ganimed controls fate and time (reining in those nocturnal horses, as we have heard), surely he does have the gods at his command.

If he mirrors the parodic situation between Jupiter and Ganimed in Dido's later dalliance with Aeneas, Marlowe also subjects this mirroring of narrative levels to ironic twists. He implicitly compares Dido and Aeneas to first one, then the other, of the divine, flirting lovers in the opening scene. By abandoning his epic duty, Aeneas becomes a type of Ganimed, a "female wanton boy" in Dido's Carthage. Dido gives Aeneas the reins of power as freely as Jupiter does Ganimed, and for the same reason--to secure his love. Dido's own words recall Jupiter's promise to Ganimed: "Stoute love in mine armes make thy Italy, / Whose Crowne and Kingdome rests at thy commande" (III.iv.57-8). However, as he is about to take up his epic vocation, Aeneas becomes more like Jupiter. In fact, when one of Aeneas's men chastises his captain for effeminacy--that is, for following the "wanton motions of alluring eyes" (IV.iii.35)--we may well recall Venus who chastises Jupiter for "playing with that female wanton boy," Ganimed.[19] And Dido herself is Ganimed-like: she is "wanton"--in the word's etymological sense, lacking discipline (specifically, martial discipline). Dido later says, with heavy irony, "Now lookes Aeneas like immortall Jove, / O where is Ganimed to hold his cup, / and Mercury to flye for what he calles?" (IV.iv.45-7). Aeneas, given over to love's dilation, may initially resemble Ganimed, but, increasingly, he comes to mirror Jupiter, whom he will eventually obey.

Marlowe thus strips Jupiter of his usual Virgilian power and dignity, by initially presenting him as a god more devoted to _Eros_ than _Mars_, and by placing the god's relationship with Ganimed on par with that of Aeneas and Dido.[20] Dido's words in her parting scene with Aeneas seem charged with dramatic irony. She points to Jupiter as the god who oversees Aeneas's epic destiny, and hence the god who is her enemy: "Wherein have I offended _Jupiter_, / That he should take _Aeneas_ from mine armes? / O no, the Gods wey not what Lovers doe" (V.i.129-31). Yet, having witnessed Jupiter in another, far less awe-inspiring light, we as audience know that Marlowe's gods _are_ intimately involved in the affairs of love; if they are deaf to the pleas of lovers, it is only because they are too involved with their own amorous exploits and conquests. Because Marlowe creates such a strong initial parody of the pious distance from which Jupiter is conventionally seen, we recall that parody even when the characters themselves are not deliberately invoking it.

Although Dido at first blames Jupiter for snatching Aeneas from her arms, she quickly qualifies this blame; in the same speech, just before Aeneas leaves her for good, she realizes that, since he has internalized Jupiter's command, she must say, "It is _Aeneas_ calles Aeneas hence" (V.i.132). By the very etymology of his name--_Jovis pater_--Jupiter proclaims himself "the father of gods and of men"

(Virgil 12). But when Aeneas heeds Jupiter's epic call, he becomes more than an obedient son; he adopts his ordained role as the "fatherly Aeneas" of Virgil's epic (127). At this moment in the play, when the Latin words of Virgil's epic begin to vie with Marlowe's own vernacular, it becomes clear that Aeneas is allied with Jupiter, and that Dido, along with Juno, will remain forever opposed to that patriarchal impulse.[21]

The authority of Jupiter's word, the "word of the father," is thus undermined not only because it is less dignified but also because it is crossed with Juno's word, the contradictory word of the mother. The parody deepens when Aeneas's mouthing of the apparently superior words of the father is overruled, at least for a time, by Dido's own Juno-like counter-discourse. Marlowe's Aeneas succumbs to Dido's dilatory powers to such an extent that Hermes must descend twice (not once, as in Virgil) in order to deliver Jupiter's command. Marlowe also shows Aeneas "speaking back," attempting to put the command into his own words, and he undercuts the single authoritative voice of the epic by heightening the discursive conflict between Aeneas and Dido.

Marlowe emphasizes the opposition between Jupiter and Dido, their battle over the body of Aeneas, by associating a single word with each position: Dido's "stay" is heard repeatedly as a counter to Jupiter's imperious "come." In a memorable passage, Marlowe gives these opposing commands symbolic importance in the larger context of the discursive battle waged in _Dido_. Aeneas, summoned by Hermes' first call in a dream, voices his conflict over assenting to leave Dido for Italy. For Aeneas Dido's voice represents the main distraction from his epic quest:

> The dreames (brave mates) that did beset my bed,
> When sleepe but newly had imbrast the night,
> Commaunds me leave these unrenowmed reames,
> Whereas Nobilitie abhors to stay,
> And none but base _Aeneas_ will abide:
> Abourd, abourd, since Fates doe bid abourd . . .
> Yet _Dido_ casts her eyes like anchors out,
> To stay my Fleete from loosing forth the Bay:
> Come backe, come backe, I heare her crye a farre,
> And let me linke thy bodie to my lips,
> That tyed together by the striving tongues,
> We may as one saile into _Italy_.
>
> (IV.iii.16-30)

For a moment, in fact, Aeneas envisions an unseemly union of the "striving tongues" belonging to him and Dido, and hence a strained harmony between the laws of epic and romance. Aeneas hopes for a resolution of his conflict: Dido's joining him in his voyage to Italy would make possible his obedience to the command of "Nobilitie" as well as to the "lawes of love" (IV.iv.48).

But Aeneas's men, mouthing the implicit precepts of the epic world, urge him to remember the separateness of these "striving tongues." Achates' words best represent the tenor of the crew's advice:

> Banish that ticing dame from forth your mouth,
> And follow your foreseeing starres in all;
> This is no life for men at armes to live,
> Where daliance doth consume a Souldiers strength,
> And wanton motions of alluring eyes,
> Effeminate our mindes inur'd to warre.
>
> (IV.iii.31-36)

Not only does Dido the temptress hold Aeneas back from his forward fate, represented by the "foreseeing starres"; even Aeneas's men recognize that her "wanton motions," which make him wander from his ordained epic destiny, affect his "mouth" and must be banished therefrom.

Significantly, Aeneas's patriarchal society sees his contact with Dido as "daliance." The etymology of this favourite Marlovian word underscores the extent to which Aeneas' forbidden relationship with Dido involves a discursive battle against the word of the father. The most common Renaissance senses of "dalliance"--"Sport, play, wanton toying" (OED sb.2) and "Waste of time in trifling, idle delay" (OED sb.4)--imply the word's affinities with the notion of dilation; but, even more strikingly, the root of the word "daliance" appears to be the Old French dalier, meaning "to chat." Throughout the fifteenth century, dalliance carries the meaning "Talk, confabulation, converse, chat" (OED sb.1). That Marlowe has carefully chosen this word is suggested by his emphasis on presenting Aeneas's wanderings away from Jupiter as a discursive wandering from, and a delay in obeying, the classical word. The play is built upon the conflict between what Aeneas himself sees as "striving tongues": between Jupiter's command, which points him towards his epic vocation, and Dido's plea, which reminds him of his romantic duty to "the lawes of love" (IV.iv.48).

At the end of Dido, the wandering Aeneas is brought back in line with the father's word. Marlowe represents Aeneas's obedience through what we might call "code-switching": the semiotic proof of Aeneas's obedience to Jupiter, and his subsequent dismissal of Dido, is his use of Latin. The free vernacular play that has characterized the play thus far, the dalliances more in keeping with romantic comedy, give way as a more serious, rigid, authoritative tone invades the play through Virgil's Latin. Far from resorting to the words of Virgil because of an immature writer's dependence on the original, Marlowe uses Virgil to intensify the conflict between "striving tongues," a conflict that has driven the plot forward. Nor is Marlowe's use of Virgil here due to the untranslateability of the original (cf. Gill, Complete

Works xiv); the play presents Virgil's words as the written "law" against which we can now perceive more clearly the nature of Dido and Aeneas's rebellion. Against the immutable writing of this law, the paternal narrative that inevitably contains them, Dido and Aeneas have set their own weak "dalliance" or wanton chat.

Marlowe does not quote Virgil's original until the final scene of the play, when he depicts the tragic catastrophe. Until this point, Marlowe's rendering of Virgil into the vernacular has ranged from straight translation and paraphrase to parody of the original. The use of the vernacular in Dido shows that free play with Jupiter's (or Virgil's) authoritative word is still possible; the emergence of Latin, however, signals the end of that free playing with the source. Thus when Hermes, "Sent from his father Jove" (V.i.95), descends to deliver Jupiter's command that Aeneas leave Dido, he transmits the message in the vernacular, the same semiotic code which had conveyed Marlowe's original parodic portrait of the divine flirting father. Marlowe creates a strong irony in the final scenes of the play by stressing that the imperious word--setting the epic narrative in motion again and cutting short the romantic dilation--comes from Jupiter, who himself has often dilated the passionate moment by stalling the horses of the night. And, given that Hermes delivers Jupiter's message in the form of Marlowe's

English, that message is subject to debate, evasion, even outright dismissal.

After Hermes' first descent to him in a dream, Aeneas shows an ambivalent response to Jupiter's command. He first says that it is subject to Dido's approval, only later that it is binding: "Let my Phenissa graunt, and then I goe: / Graunt she or no, Aeneas must away" (IV.iii.6-7). Hermes' first imposition of Jupiter's command is indeed overruled by Dido, at least for a time. On this first attempt, Dido succeeds in usurping Jupiter's authority. She seems even to transcend mortal limitations when she creates her own heaven with Aeneas: "in his lookes I see eternitie, / And heele make me immortall with a kisse" (IV.iv.122-23). Dido overreaches heaven by claiming not just that Aeneas looks "like immortall Jove," and wants only Ganimed and Mercury to wait upon him, but also that she and Aeneas outdo the very language of heaven: "Heavens envious of our joyes is waxen pale, / And when we whisper, then the starres fall downe, / To be partakers of our honey talke" (IV.iv.52-54). These lines show Dido asserting the power of her lover's "daliance" or chat over the divinely sanctioned authority of the epic. Three of the most melodious lines in the play, they also show Marlowe proving the power of his own "honey talke," his vernacular, over that of the authoritative Latin original. As a Renaissance translator, Marlowe may well have fantasized that his source, "envious" and "waxen pale," might fall, Icarus-like, before the mighty lines of his own work.

Dido becomes Aeneas's "patronesse" (IV.iv.55); he becomes "Didos husband" (IV.iv.67) and a "Carthaginian King" (IV.iv.78). Dido detains him not only with her words but also with her physical power--she hangs his sails in her bedroom, breaks his oars, tears his tackling with her hands, and hides his son Ascanius, so that Aeneas cannot sail for Italy. As Act V opens, Marlowe's Dido has conquered Aeneas as Virgil never allowed her to do, for Aeneas plans to rest in Carthage, building "a statelier Troy" (V.i.2). He ironically says, "Triumph, my mates, our travels are at end" (V.i.1). Marlowe daringly transforms the Virgilian narrative, showing the possible "end" it could have if his parodic creation, an Ovidian Jupiter, were to triumph. But just at this point, Marlowe has Hermes descend for the second time to deliver Jupiter's message, in person. Even at this "end," or rather false start, Aeneas shows such inattention to the message that Hermes rebukes him: "Spendst thou thy time about this little boy, / And givest not eare unto the charge I bring?" (V.i.52-53).

In the final scene between Dido and Aeneas, the conflict clearly lies between Dido's words, which resound in Aeneas's "heart," and Jupiter's "command" (V.i.82,99), which demands his dutiful obedience. But because Marlowe's

Dido, who is responsible for Aeneas's "lingering here, neglecting Italy" (V.i.97), has successfully delayed Aeneas's epic quest, we may well think, with Dido, "yet Aeneas will not leave his love" (V.i.98). Once Dido has realized that, though "These words proceed not from Aeneas heart" (V.i.102), Aeneas will obey Jupiter's commands anyway, she tellingly resorts to appropriating the last measure of power within her grasp. She switches from the vernacular to the Latin lines of the original. But this switching of linguistic codes spells Dido's downfall, for Aeneas only responds with the immutable written words of Virgil, with "one of the most famous half-lines in world literature" (Gill, Complete Works xiv).

[Dido.] Si bene quid de te merui, fuit aut tibi quidquam
Dulce meum, miserere domus labentis, et istam,
Oro, si quis adhuc precibus lucus, exue mentem.
Aeneas. Desine meque tuis incendere teque querelis;
Italiam non sponte sequor.
(V.i.136-40)

Though Dido retaliates against these authoritative words of the original with another long entreaty, followed by a harangue against him, Aeneas only speaks another two lines in the play; and those lines show him standing firm, this time on the side of Jupiter's written law rather than on the side of Dido's spoken vernacular: "In vain, my love, thou spend'st thy fainting breath, / If words might move me, I were overcome" (V.i.153-54). Dido's "breath" is indeed feeble and "fainting" when set against the weighty (written) words of the original narrative that dictates her downfall.

When Dido, just before she runs to perform her fiery suicide, again cites the Latin words of the original, she is ironically acknowledging her own defeat by the gods. Praying to the gods who have destroyed her, she again attempts to triumph over Aeneas by appropriating the Latin associated with those gods who determine the shape of human history. Dido's use of the Latin words of the epic are at once a more forceful invocation to the gods, and a foreshadowing of Aeneas's own eventual defeat by the (epic) forces of history:

> . . . from mine ashes let a Conquerour rise,
> That may revenge this treason to a Queene,
> By plowing up his Countries with the Sword:
> Betwixt this land and that be never league,
> *Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas*
> *Imprecor: arma armis: pugnent ipsique nepotes*....
> (V.i.306-311)

The "Conquerour" whom Marlowe inserts into Virgil's narrative is of course Hannibal, who will, at least for a moment in history, defeat the Roman descendants of Aeneas. Dido's final lines again show her heroic attempt to set her own spoken word against the written Latin that destroys her. In her last words, Marlowe has Dido set the "striving tongues" of the vernacular and Latin against each other: "Live false Aeneas, truest, Dido dyes, Sic sic juvat ire sub umbras" (V.i.312-13). Fittingly, it is in voicing the Latin that Dido goes to her death. Using the hieratic language of Latin lends a dignity and solemnity to Dido's suicide.

While Marlowe accomplishes the tragic catastrophe in Dido by finally returning to Virgil's narrative and words, he also undermines the authority of those words when he ends his play not with the dignified death of Dido alone, as did Virgil, but instead with a triple suicide. First, Iarbus (who throughout the play has suffered from a foolish, unrequited love for Dido), and then Anna, Dido's sister (who has suffered an equally unrequited love for Iarbus), commit themselves to the flames. By tripling the "tragic" deaths resulting from thwarted love, Marlowe ends the play on a parodic note. He accomplishes a final "oneupmanship" of Virgil not only by extending and exaggerating the narrative, but also by doing so in the vernacular. Marlowe masterfully ties together the narrative levels in Anna's final words:

> this shall I doe,
> That Gods and men may pitie this my death,
> And rue our ends senceles of life or breath:
> Now sweet Iarbus stay, I come to thee.

(V.i.326-29)

Marlowe's words here unite the "striving tongues" that have contended with each other throughout his "translation": the opposing commands "come" and "stay" have generated conflict in the worlds both of "Gods and men." But the audience may well find it difficult to "pitie" or "rue" the "ends" of the three characters who have literally consumed themselves for love. Not only are Iarbus and Anna undeveloped characters, whose passion inspires no great sympathy, but indeed, as Roma Gill points out (Complete Works 12), their deaths undermine the "tragic dignity" of Dido's suicide.

However, if it is "of Marlowe's construction" (Gill, Complete Works 120), the triple suicide should alert us to a deliberate purpose on Marlowe's part. Clearly, Marlowe's switching to a more parodic vernacular with the last words of the play represents yet another attempt to overreach Virgil. Although Virgil appears to triumph, having determined the shape of Marlowe's final narrative, yet Marlowe ultimately asserts his own word, the power of his vernacular. Thus in the play of "striving tongues" that has characterized Dido, Marlowe and Dido--not Virgil and Jupiter--have the last word. While in a tragic world, the authority of the father's word cannot ultimately be overcome, yet Marlowe accomplishes a dilation, an ironic magnification, of that word.

Marlowe's audience would certainly have recognized the original lines of Virgil's Aeneid--they may even have recited them along with Dido and Aeneas. In fact, in switching from the vernacular (the language of the lovers' romantic, and rebellious, dalliance) to Latin (the language of the authoritative epic), Marlowe uses a semiotic code that his child-actors, as well as his noble audience, could have easily recognized and understood. Marlowe's parody of Virgil in Dido intensifies when we place the play in the context of its performance: it was performed by the Chapel Children (Cope), and viewed by members of the court, all of whom would have not only memorized but also learned, from an early age, to revere Virgil. In their schooling, Marlowe, his actors, and his audience may indeed all have experienced the same conflict as Aeneas and Dido between Latin, the "father tongue," and the vernacular, the "mother tongue" absorbed in one's infancy.

Latin can be called the "father tongue" of the Renaissance because it is backed by the weight of an authoritative tradition. To recall Bakhtin's terms, Renaissance Latin is an "authoritative discourse"--"the word of the fathers," "connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher" (342). And there are other grounds for calling Latin the "father tongue." In the Renaissance it was also a language appropriated almost entirely by men: handed down from the older male generation to the younger, Latin was a hieratic language that largely excluded women. Walter Ong has shown that the study of Latin in the Renaissance served as a kind of puberty rite that entrenched patriarchal, and epic, values. Indeed, as Ong argues, "Learned Latin was a ceremonial polemic instrument which from classical antiquity until the beginnings of romanticism helped keep the entire academic curriculum programmed as a form of ritual male combat centered on disputation" (17). The vernacular, on the other hand, can be called the "mother tongue": it may more readily be associated with women, but having been learned in the lap of one's mother or nursemaid, it remains the language of one's deepest emotional life, the language of the subconscious. In their final speech together, when Aeneas tells Dido he must leave, there is some irony in Dido's remark, "These words proceed not from Aeneas' heart" (V.i.102). Aeneas agrees, and as if to underscore that they are no longer speaking the language of the heart, Marlowe has them switch some thirty lines later to the "father tongue," Latin. In the world of Marlowe's play, it is Dido who is finally denied authority; her word is associated with Marlowe's vernacular, his "mother tongue."[22] While Aeneas is momentarily detained by that word, ultimately it is the word of the father that triumphs.

iv.

The linguistic contest that surfaces only at the end of Dido is evident throughout Dr. Faustus. Latin is for Faustus, as for Dido and Aeneas, the ultimate language of authority which can be debated or even parodied but not, finally, evaded. Dr. Faustus is, like Dido, built upon a conflict between "striving tongues." The conspicuous presence of Latin in the play suggests the centrality of Faustus's conflict between the "striving tongues" of Latin and the vernacular. At times, Faustus even reacts against the authoritative Latin language as though it were a character with a life of its own. For the most part, however, Faustus tries to appropriate written Latin in order to provide his own kind of vernacular "daliance."

Clearly, Faustus's rebellion against authority is the central conflict in the play. His is the story of Everyman, the hero who, pending his summons by Death, must decide to submit and forgo earthly delights or else suffer everlasting death in the fires of hell.[23] But, anticipating Milton's Satan, Faustus's constitution seems such that he never can "submit or yield." While he comes close to repenting several times, repentance for Faustus seems an impossibility.[24] Unlike Everyman, Faustus is not redeemed at the midnight hour when Death comes to claim him. In the midst of his horseplay, Faustus attempts to comfort himself by denying the consequences of his transgressions: "Tush, Christ did call the thief upon the cross; / Then rest thee, Faustus, quiet in conceit" (xv.25-6); however, the conventional end of the morality play--redemption--never comes. It is precisely his "conceit" or "wit" (a recurring word in the play, and a significant one for Marlowe as University Wit) that prevents Faustus from repenting. Faustus is "Everyman as Intellectual, with the axiological choice centered in the problem of knowledge" (Heilman 331).

Dr. Faustus can be read as a "tragedy of knowledge" because Faustus's problem is like that of Adam and Eve after the fall: aspiring to godhead, he gains the forbidden knowledge of good and evil. Modern critics often divide on the issue of whether Faustus most desires knowledge or pleasure (including power), but "the distinction . . . is foreign to Marlowe" (Nicholas Brooke, "Moral Tragedy" 667). Indeed, Dorothy Coleman has shown that the Renaissance often described the acquisition of knowledge in sensual terms. Montaigne, for example, speaks of education using "culinary terminology" (Coleman 81). The ancient authors, in Florio's translation, should serve as nourishing mental food: "what availes it us to have our bellies full of meat, if it be not digested? If it bee not transchanged in us? except it nourish, augment, and strengthen us?" (I: 139). Marlowe's use of gustatory imagery in Dr. Faustus can best be understood in the context of the "innutrition" theory which runs through French and English texts: as Blount's Glossographia translates the word, "innutrition" refers to the "nourishing or bringing up" of literature" (qtd. in Coleman 83), and translates itself in Renaissance literature as a metaphor "of eating, digesting and mentally chewing ancient texts" (Coleman 83). If Faustus's transgression involves a failure to read (or even to translate), it also implies a digestive disorder, an inability to absorb the nutrients of classical and biblical texts. In this context, his gluttonous appetite gains greater ironic force. Barber shows that "Faustus's gluttonous preoccupation with satisfactions of the mouth and throat is also a delight in the power and beauty of language" (123). Faustus's fatal choice "[t]o eat and drink damnation" (in a blasphemous parody of the Lord's Supper) does not, however, entirely undermine the heroism of his defiance: "It is because the alternatives are not simply good or evil that Marlowe has not written a morality play but a tragedy: there is the further, heroic alternative" (Barber 102, 123).

The play's gustatory imagery suggests Faustus's participation in the primal sin of eating the fatal fruit of the Tree of Knowledge: his transgression is often described, especially by the Chorus, in terms of an appetitive disorder. Thus as the play opens, the Chorus says that Faustus is "glutted now with learning's golden gifts" and "surfeits upon cursed necromancy"; "Nothing so sweet as magic is to him" (Prol. 24-26). Whereas his first parents ate an apple, Faustus has gorged himself with "learning's golden gifts."[25] His voracious appetite for magic and pleasure throughout the play shows his links with the legendary Magus of the sources, whose nickname was "Faustus the insatiable." Marlowe changes his narrative source by adding highly conventionalized morality-play elements, notably the Good and Bad Angels and the Parade of the Seven Deadly Sins.[26] And Marlowe makes Faustus glory in his search for forbidden knowledge. Overreaching his forefather by the sheer tumescence of his pride, Faustus in fact compares himself to Adam. As Beelzebub is introducing the spectacle of the Seven Deadly Sins, Faustus cries, "That sight will be as pleasant to me as paradise was to Adam the first day of his creation" (vi.108-9). But of course Faustus's overtly blasphemous remark is replete with tragic irony, for if Adam experienced ineffable bliss in paradise, it was there that he also first felt his nakedness and tasted the fruits of sin, which in Judeo-Christian terms is defined as "transgression of the law." As if to underscore the irony that Faustus's allusion to Adam only points to the man's own miserable fallen state, Lucifer responds, "Talk not of paradise or creation, but mark the show" (vi.110).

If Faustus recapitulates the primal fall into forbidden knowledge, he loses "paradise and creation" forever, finding no Miltonic "paradise within, / Happier far." His attempts at magical creation throughout the play are indeed only illusory "shows," parodies of divine creation. Before his clowning with the Pope, for example, he says, "in this show let me an actor be" (viii.76). Even Faustus's much awaited presentation to Emperor Charles and his court of "that famous conqueror / Great Alexander, and his paramour / In their true shapes and state majestical" (xii.30) is nothing more than a dumb show. Faustus commands Charles to "demand no questions of the King, / But in dumb silence let them come and go" (xii.47-8); and later Faustus must remind the German Emperor, "These are but shadows, not substantial" (xii.55).

Hence Faustus's "miracles" at best amount to an insubstantial parody of divine creation. Like his demonic consorts, Faustus can only ape God or other authority figures. Marlowe conveys Faustus's parody in metadramatic terms, by showing him as a would-be actor, directed by Mephistophilis; Jan Kott offers an excellent treatment of the play's "polytheatricality" or use of different theatrical discourses. But what requires more adequate treatment is Faustus's parody of literary texts. Such is the metafictionality of the play, that Faustus paves his way to hell by becoming not merely an actor and spectator but, even more fundamentally, a reader.[27] In D. F.

MacKenzie's memorable phrase, "Faustus reads his way to hell" (64).

More than a broadly universalized Everyman, or even "Everyman as Intellectual," Faustus seems to be the Everyman of humanistic print-culture. Against the established authority of classical authors and, above all, Church doctrine, Faustus pits his own rebellious word, thereby embodying a type of Icarian rebellion against the "word of the father." It is fitting that Faustus finally vows to burn his books, for these books represent the "waxen wings" which symbolically melt away as he flies towards "heavenly power," and make him fall to a "devilish exercise" (Prol. 23).

It is his books, containing "learning's golden gifts," that effect Faustus's fall, by tempting him with the inclination and apparent means to practise the art of necromancy and conjuration. When he begins instructing Faustus in this black art, in fact, Mephostophilis recommends a prominent magical book. With a characteristic blindness to the realities of hell, and in a travesty of divine authority, Faustus exclaims,

> . . . necromantic books are heavenly;
> Lines, circles, letters, and characters:
> Ay, these are those that Faustus most desires.
> O, what a world of profit and delight,
> Of power, of honour, of omnipotence,

> Is promised to the studious artisan!
> All things that move between the quiet poles
> Shall be at my command. . . .
>
> (i.49-56)

Through his bookishness, his "learned skill" (Chor. 2.10), "Learned Faustus" (Chor. 1.1) attempts to make himself "eternized." But, although the "Lines, circles, letters, and characters" of necromancy draw him with promises of power and delight, the play shows the ultimate emptiness of the language whereby Faustus works his insubstantial miracles. Mephostophilis reveals that Faustus's "conjuring speeches" were "the cause, but yet per accidens" that raised him (iii.47-48). When Faustus opened the conjuring book, the devil by his own admission was already on his way, since Marlowe's hero had used the "shortest cut for conjuring," abjuring the Trinity and praying to Lucifer (iii.54-56). One of the most searing ironies of the play is that books (or writing), which lure Faustus to his doom, prove hollow, so that finally "here's nothing writ" (v.79).[28]

While Faustus clearly puts himself in the role of a scholarly exegete of classical and even biblical texts, the opening soliloquy reveals him as an isogete, propounding his own idiosyncratic misprisions of the works he has read. Faustus's first words in the play involve a systematic dismissal of the branches of learning, in the tradition of

Agrippa's _De vanitate et incertitudine scientiarum_, a work whose many editions in the Renaissance attest to its wide popularity. But Marlowe has Faustus overreach Agrippa's own formulation "Of the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences." Agrippa had advocated the study of divinity as conducive to the attainment of the only true wisdom; after following Agrippa by renouncing in turn logic or disputation, medicine, and law, and indeed by asserting, "When all is done, divinity is best" (i.37), Faustus renounces even divinity.[29] Yet, despite his ironic farewell--"Divinity, adieu!" (i.47)--,Faustus cannot surrender to God ("a Dieu") the matters of divinity. Coveting a "dominion" that "Stretcheth as far as doth the mind of man," Faustus seeks to be a "demi-god," that is, a "sound magician" (i.59-62). He is explicit about his desire for godhood: "Here tire, my brains, to get a deity!" (i.62). And, as the opening soliloquy shows, Faustus's blasphemous attempts at "daring God out of heauen with that Atheist _Tamburlan_" (Greene 7: 7-8) are mirrored in his agonistic readings of scholastic authority.

Marlowe initially shows Faustus as a translator and reader, though not a faithful or literal-minded one. If his scholastic background has trained him to recognize the difference between _transcriptio_ (strict word-for-word translation) and _translatio_ (imitation or free adaptation), Faustus himself seems incapable of reading a classical text except by retelling it in his own words. He habitually takes lines out of context and usurps the authority of the (Latin) original by setting in its place his own (vernacular) version of reality. The clearest instance of this act of linguistic usurpation comes of course with Faustus's translation of the fatal phrase from Jerome's Bible:

> *Stipendium peccati mors est*. Ha! *Stipendium, etc*. The reward of sin is death: that's hard. *Si peccasse negamus fallimur, et nulla est in nobis veritas*. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there's no truth in us. Why, then, belike, we must sin, and so consequently die.
> Ay, we must die an everlasting death.
> What doctrine call you this? *Che sara, sara*:
> What will be, shall be!
>
> (i.39-47)

Faustus's distortion of the original text here is both a symptom and a consequence of his desire to be his own "deity," his own authority, and it foreshadows his eventual destruction by that law, couched in biblical Latin, that ultimately revenges itself on the individual who attempts to transgress it. Dismissing the law as mere "doctrine," Faustus exemplifies the self-deceived, hubristic law-breaker or sinner, for again he lapses into the vernacular, setting in the place of the "hard" and weighty intonation of Jerome not only a light-hearted and popular proverb in the Italian vernacular but also its translated English counterpart. "What will be" and "shall be" for Faustus, of course, is the eventual triumph of that law which he has so delighted in breaking.

If Faustus is a vain or boastful philosopher in the tradition of the classical _philosophus gloriosus_ figure (_Anatomy_ 39), his folly and clowning are mirrored at the level of the sub-plot by the literal fool and clown, Wagner and Robin. Michael D. Bristol has fruitfully examined the carnivalesque import of the clowning scenes in _Dr. Faustus_. But Wagner's travesty of Faustus's own Latinity (itself a parody of classical Latin) deserves closer critical attention. At both the level of the main plot and the sub-plot, the situation between the one parodied and the one parodying is analogous to an Icarian rebellion by the son against the father, where the son attempts to overthrow the father's word. In the main plot, Faustus not only sets himself against divine authority by aligning himself with demonic forces which parody God; he expresses this rebellion on the earthly plane by his attempts to overthrow authoritative discourse of various kinds. In the farcical subplot involving Faustus's servants, Faustus's actions and language in turn are parodied by Wagner, his favoured servant and, as designated heir (xix.20-23), the surrogate son of Faustus. Wagner speaks a broken and macaronic Latin that makes ridiculous Faustus's attempts at conjuring both classical authors and demonic spirits. The first scene in the sub-plot, involving Wagner and the Clown (Robin), preceding as it does a crucial scene between Faustus and Mephistophilis, throws a parodic spotlight on the latter exchange. Wagner lords it over Robin, attempting to keep him in a servile position through the use of Latin. First Wagner asks Robin, "Sirrah, wilt thou be my man and wait on me? and I will make thee go like _Qui mihi discipulus_" (iv.13-14). As Jump points out, the Latin phrase (meaning "you who are my pupil") begins the poem "_Carmen de Moribus_, by William Lily . . . the schoolmaster, which was much read in Elizabethan grammar-schools" (24n14). That Marlowe's scene here, where Wagner threatens to beat Robin much as a schoolmaster would a pupil in the course of a Latin lesson, is a parody of a Renaissance schoolroom becomes clear when Wagner thunders, "Villain, call me Master Wagner, and see that you walk attentively, and let your right eye be always diametrically fixed upon my left heel, that thou mayest _quasi vestigiis nostris insistere_" (45-48). In both form and content, Wagner's words illuminate Faustus's scholastically conceived project, to manage others so that they might "tread as it were in our footsteps" (Jump's translation of the Latin phrase).

The travesty of Latin authority is as integral a part of Marlowe's play as the clowning. When Marlowe sends Faustus to Rome itself, so that "The Pope shall curse that Faustus came to Rome" (viii.124), he offers a popular Protestant parody of *pileata Roma* ("Rome crowned with a fool's cap"). But the Marlovian send-up of Romish authority goes further, to become *lingua Roma pileata*. It is the language of Rome, and the inherited Roman language of the Renaissance, that is crowned with a fool's cap in Marlowe's play. And, as the play progresses and the tragic irony of Faustus's own soul-murder intensifies, the Latin language--as a visible sign of his hubris--becomes the very fool's cap that Faustus (like Wagner) wears.

In Faustus's--if not entirely in Marlowe's--day, *lingua Roma* is *lingua sacra*, the language of the Church. Thus it is hardly surprising that, in contemporary books on witchcraft, Latin is the language in which spirits are to be conjured and addressed (Jump 14n138). If the devil apes God and the form of divine worship, demonic fellowship logically involves a parody of liturgical authority. Faustus's conjurations invariably take the form of Latin, as when he first calls forth Mephostophilis: "*Per Iehovam, Gehennam, et consecratum aqua quam nunc spargo, signumque crucis quod nunc facio, et per vota nostra, ipse nunc surgat nobis dicatus Mephostophilis*!" (iii.21-34). Wrenching the rites of worship out of their proper context, as he had earlier done with the "Lines, . . . letters, and characters" of classical texts, Faustus also overturns the Holy Trinity ("Valeat numen triplex Iehovae!") with the infernal trinity of Lucifer, Beelzebub, and Demogorgon. But, caught in the irony of a tragic situation, he must nevertheless rely upon the (Latinized) divine name to work his magical illusions. Indeed, Faustus's magic belongs to that branch of necromancy that Agrippa describes as an "endeuoure to coniure, and binde the deuill of hell especially coniured with a certaine verture of the names of God" (130). In his "incantations," Marlowe's hero uses "Jehovah's name, / Forward and backward anagrammatiz'd," as well as "The breviated names of holy saints" (iii.8-10) and the "Figures" and "characters of signs" that recall his rapture in the opening soliloquy. Hence Faustus attests to his own self-deception and servitude to that parodic "word of the father," represented by the "father of lies," for when he initially swore allegiance to Lucifer, Faustus vowed "Never to name God" (vi.99).

Not only is Latin a major element in their demonic worship, but Faustus's exchanges with Mephostophilis are prime examples of what theorists of bilingual cultures call "code-switching."[30] These exchanges in the play parody scholastic as well as liturgical authority. Shortly after he has signed away his soul and, despite lingering doubts, has resolved himself not to die, despair, or repent, Faustus attempts to comfort himself by calling, "Come, Mephostophilis, let us dispute again" (vi.34). That Faustus is in his study at this point recalls the opening scene of the play and thus underscores the circularity of his situation, and indeed of his thinking. Marlowe heightens the irony of Faustus's disdainful questioning of classical logic--"Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end?" (i.8)--by presenting the purportedly mystical session with Mephostophilis as a scholastic disputation. As we remember his earlier disdainful questioning and weigh the rewards of his demonic contract, we may well echo Faustus's own words, "Affords this art no greater miracle?" (i.9). Faustus himself recognizes the banality of his dealings with Mephostophilis. Asking if the stars have "all / One motion, both _situ et tempore_" (vi.45), Faustus becomes impatient with the straightforward answer and suggests a comparison between his disputation with Mephostophilis and the earlier parodic exchange between Wagner and Robin: "These slender questions Wagner can decide. / Hath Mephostophilis no greater skill?" (vi.49-50). Faustus then delivers a well-schooled answer to his own question and realizes, with considerable irony, "These are freshmen's suppositions" (vi.55-6). As Jump notes, the term "supposition" is taken from scholastic logic and denotes the basis of an argument (37n56). Nor do Faustus and Mephostophilis advance beyond the elementary stages of what Ong called that "ritual male combat centered on disputation": they wage this combat, at least partially, by means of learned Latin. The questioning of Mephostophilis in Scene vi thus seems a parody of a contemporary university translation exercise, as well as a parodic disputation or catechism.

However, even the relatively feeble power of the university scholar eludes Faustus, since Mephostophilis refuses to answer his questions regarding the creation of the world, questions belonging at any rate to that branch of divinity already abandoned by Faustus. Thus Faustus never succeeds in usurping parental authority, not even its insubstantial shadow, the demonic imitation, at which he has grasped. The striving filial word in Dr. Faustus ultimately gives way before the powerful paternal word of authority.

Throughout the play, Marlowe emphasizes Faustus's transgression of the law as a rebellion against parental authority. It is not surprising that Faustus cannot heed the Old Man, the human counterpart of the Good Angel, since that paternal figure addresses him as "gentle son" (viii.50). The filial position of subservience is precisely what Faustus abhors. As a way of underscoring that this abhorrence is the very essence of sin, Marlowe outlines with broad strokes the collective scorn of the Seven Deadly Sins for their parental origins. Pride, "first" of the sins, says, "I disdain to have any parents," and compares himself, significantly, to "Ovid's flea," which "can creep into every corner of a wench" (vi.115-16). The bawdy, carnivalesque allusion provides a comment on Faustus's own pride--faintly at this point (through its parody of scholastic pretensions to classical literacy), and much more strongly later, when the dying Faustus, disdaining to the end the acknowledgement of divine parental authority, quotes Ovid. Covetousness, "begotten of an old churl in a leather bag" (vi.125-26), also reminds us of Faustus, who was "born, of parents base of stock" (Prol. 11). The parallel is even more obvious with Envy, "begotten of a chimney-sweeper and an oyster-wife" (vi.130-31), who ironically anticipates Faustus's own tragic _anagnorisis_: "I cannot read and therefore wish all books burned" (131-32). Envy's anticipation of Faustus's final line in the play--"I'll burn my books!"--may even hint at a connection between Faustus's own envious misreadings and his base parentage. At the end of the play, Faustus cries out, "Curs'd be the parents that engender'd me!" (xix.180), echoing both his earlier flirtations with being cursed by the Church, and the travestying Friar who repeated, "Cursed be . . . _Maledicat_ _Dominus_" (ix.102-112). Faustus's curse on his parents is tantamount to a curse on God.

Faustus exemplifies the sinful spirit that fashions itself as creator, not creature (begetter, not begotten). Gluttony's parents "are all dead" (145), and Wrath has "neither father nor mother" (138). In fact, Wrath issues Faustus and the other infernal spectators a cryptic warning: "I was born in hell; and look to it, for some of you shall be my father" (142-43). Allegorizing our own reading, we might say that the sinful nature which fancies itself self-begotten is indeed "born in hell" and creates its own hell (witness Mephostophilis's "Why, this is hell, nor am I out of it" [iii.78]). The only substantial act of fathering that sin can do is to engender hell and provoke the (real) Wrath of God.

Faustus is made to feel divine wrath as, experiencing his own apocalypse, he vacillates between faithful translation of biblical truth and a rebellious refusal to be overcome by the paternal word:

> see where God
> Stretcheth out his arm and bends his ireful brows.
> Mountains and hills, come, come, and fall on me,
> And hide me from the heavy wrath of God!
> No, no:
> Then will I headlong run into the earth.
> Earth, gape!
>
> (xix.150-56)

Following his translation of the famous biblical passage (Revelations 6:16; Hosea 10:8), Faustus's "No, no" becomes highly significant of his continuing resolution to gain a last vestige of authority through language. The sheer mood of the verbs testifies to Faustus's linguistic rebellion, for the imperative mood, as the etymology of the adjective implies, is appropriate to those who wish to command: the imperative is "the grammatical mood that expresses the will to influence the behavior of another" (Webster's sb.1a).[31] Marlowe makes use of the imperative mood six times in the very short quotation above; in Faustus's last soliloquy as a whole, Marlowe puts into his hero's mouth no less than a staggering twenty-five imperative verbs. Contrast to this Marlowe's narrative source, the Damnable Life, in which the fictional Faustus neither translates the biblical passage nor employs a single imperative verb (see Jump's appendix, 139). Clearly, Marlowe takes great pains to insist upon Faustus's sin as a transgression of linguistic, as well as spiritual, authority.

It is in the context of Marlowe's overall strategy of linguistic parody (a strategy which our analysis of Dido has revealed as characteristic of his work) that we must place Faustus's most memorable travesty of biblical authority, at the point where he signs the contract with Lucifer. Faustus's very blood refuses to cooperate with his inclination so that he can write his own damnation. Recognizing the congealing as a portent, Faustus asks,

> Why streams it not, that I may write afresh?
> 'Faustus gives to thee his soul':O, there it stay'd.
> Why shouldst thou not? is not thy soul thine own?

> Then write again: 'Faustus gives to thee his soul'.
> (v.66-69)

It is only when Mephostophilis brings the chafer of fire that man and devil can accomplish together the giving away of something that, through an infernal paradox, belongs to neither. Marlowe moreover stresses the intensity of Faustus's desire to write his own damnation to a far greater extent than does the source, for there is no mention in P.F.'s translation of any clotting of the blood. Marlowe may have developed Faustus's parodic use of Latin from a hint in the source, however, for the Latin warning, "*homo fuge*," does originally appear inscribed on Faustus's arm.

When he succeeds in signing away his soul, Marlowe's Faustus recapitulates his opening soliloquy, with his earlier disdain at classical (Latin) writing. Through the interplay between Latin and the vernacular, between the word of the father and Faustus's own blasphemous counter-discourse, Marlowe skillfully represents the crux of Faustus's problem:

> *Consummatum est*: this bill is ended,
> And Faustus hath bequeath'd his soul to Lucifer.
> But what is this inscription on mine arm?
> *Homo fuge*! Whither should I fly?
> If unto God, he'll throw me down to hell.--
> My senses are deceiv'd, here's nothing writ.--

> O yes, I see it plain; even here is writ,
> _Homo fuge_! Yet shall not Faustus fly.
>
> (v.74-81)

Faustus's last words in vernacular English here exhibit an unusual and forced syntax, which changes the fundamentally indicative mood of the sentence to what seems an imperative, signalling the Faustian impulse to command through language, to set one's own word over and against the imperious word of the father.

Attentive readers will recognize the dialectical technique here as a Marlovian convention. Faustus is guilty of the same type of rebellion as Dido, who pitted her evocative "stay" against Jupiter's finally triumphant "come." Faustus, moreover, like Marlowe's Aeneas before that warrior leaves Dido, refuses to heed the divine imperative which calls for _movement_ on his part. Repentance (a physical turnabout, as the root-sense of the word denotes) is precisely what Faustus cannot manage. Instead, he chooses a kind of dilation of sensual delights: "My four-and-twenty years of liberty / I'll spend in pleasure and in dalliance" (viii.61-2). Faustus traps himself in his own self-centredness, in the purportedly magical circle of an insubstantial linguistic play. Thus in his final soliloquy, when he desires that, through a Pythagorean _metempsychosis_, "This soul should fly" from him into a beast, he remains immobilized (xix.175).

Faustus's suspicion that his "senses are deceiv'd" makes him puzzle over whether he sees something "writ" or rather "nothing writ." And Mephostophilis later confesses to Faustus,

> 'Twas I that, when thou wert i' the way to heaven,
> Damm'd up thy passage; when thou took'st the book
> To view the scriptures, then I turn'd the leaves
> And led thine eye.
>
> (xix.93-96)

Faustus's damnation comes as a direct consequence of his inability to read well. The Good Angel states as much when it first speaks, warning Faustus to "lay that damned book aside" and "Read, read the scriptures; that is blasphemy" (i.69, 72). Yet, by using a slightly ambiguous relative pronoun, the Good Angel makes the exact nature of blasphemy unclear. Presumably, in performance the Angel would point to the "damned book" on Faustus's desk; but to Marlowe's own reader the phrase "that is blasphemy" could seem to refer to the reading of the scriptures. One might well agree, then, with a former undergraduate student of mine who remarked that "the Good Angel doesn't put up much of a fight."[32] In fact, Faustus's problem is that he cannot read without blaspheming, and the Good Angel's skillfully ambiguous sentence forces Marlowe's own readers to realize, with Faustus, that "danger is in words" (xviii.27).

Because he has "abjured" and "blasphemed" God (xix.55-56), Faustus cannot call on him; "though God forbade it . . . Faustus hath done it" (xix.64). Seeing a "virtue in [his] heavenly words" (iii.29)--where in reality there is "nothing writ"--Faustus inclines towards the Bad Angel's demonic exhortation, "Be thou on earth as Jove is in the sky, / Lord and commander of these elements" (i.75-76).

Faustus's blasphemous echo of Christ's last words on the cross--Consummatum est--attests to his strong Icarian drive to be "Lord and commander of these elements." Marlowe's hero overreaches (through a supreme blasphemy) what is for the Christian the ultimate, indeed the only, accomplishment: Christ's redemption of humanity through his deliberately chosen sacrificial death. Of course, as Kott shows, Faustus's echo of Christ belongs to the tradition of parodia sacra, the parodic treatment of the Bible practised by medieval ecclesiasts and subsequently inherited by Renaissance writers. Rabelais, perfecter of the Renaissance carnivalesque, in Book 4, Chapter 19 of Gargantua and Pantagruel has his character Friar John use just this phrase, Consummatum est, to refer to satisfying his bodily needs (493).[33]

Yet the allusion to John 19:30 is significant not only because it shows Faustus again indulging in his own dismembering "translation" of a biblical passage but also because it reveals his insistent identification with the

Son, not the Father, of the Trinity. Constance Kuriyama points out the frequency with which Marlowe has Faustus voice this filial identification with Christ, in conjunction with a fear of the father.[34] When hell gapes before him, Faustus clings pathetically to the name of Christ, attempting to use it as a shield against the Father's wrath. In this final soliloquy, Marlowe poignantly recalls Faustus's initial signing of the contract, when the scholar's blood would not "stream":

> O, I'll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down?
> See, see, where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!
> One drop would save my soul, half a drop! Ah, my Christ!--
> Rend not my heart for naming of my Christ;
> Yet will I call on him.
>
> (xix.145-49)

Blocked by the Father's ire, however, precipitated by a sworn allegiance to Lucifer, Faustus cannot feel Christ's mercy. And he now realizes that the redemptive blood, once freely flowing for him, has effectively congealed for all time, as Mephostophilis had suggested: "Fond worlding, now his heart-blood dries with grief" (xix.12).

Although God's victory is inevitable and the end to sensual dilation is imminent, yet Faustus continues his desperate attempts to overreach authority through language.

Thus, with "one bare hour to live" (xix.134), and recalling Jupiter who stopped time to prolong erotic delight, Faustus quotes Ovid's famous line from the Amores (I.xiii.40), "O lente lente currite noctis equi!" (142). This is the epiphanic moment of Marlovian tragedy. The impulse to pursue "pleasure and dalliance," to escape the inexorable march of time, is crushed as the tragic law writes the death of the hero. For us the earth seems momentarily to stop turning on its axis as Marlowe's heroes speak their "honey talke"; but then "The stars move still, time runs, the clock will strike" (xix.143). The law will come, the hero must be damned.

The brilliance of Marlowe's dilatory skill becomes even more evident when we compare Faustus to other morality-play protagonists. Whereas Everyman finally learns to mouth Church doctrine, fittingly expressed in Latin, Faustus refuses to the bitter end any submission to the "law" represented by Church authority. Thus his mouthing of Latin is always necessarily parodic. And, even in allowing his protagonist a kind of vernacular dilation, Marlowe alludes to the gulf between Faustus and other orthodox morality heroes. Faustus's penultimate line in the play--"Ugly hell, gape not!" (xix.189)--is a case in point. Recalling his earlier imperative--"Earth gape!" (156)--Faustus's command that hell gape not is a final attempt to usurp divine authority, since God alone holds power over hell and death. Indeed, the fourteeth-century morality play The Creation of the World, at the moment of tragic revelation, offers a similar and most evocative line, which has been translated "Let Hell gape, when the Father names it" (Kott 18). Yet Faustus will name hell in defiance of the Father, and of the Father's word. Faustus cannot reconcile himself with the incarnate "Word of the Father," represented in the Christian tradition by Christ the Son. He continues to usurp the paternal position by attempting to gain control of the paternal language of authority. Yet, like Icarus and Phaeton, he burns himself in the attempt, plummeting in an everlasting disdain of fatherly warnings.

There is considerable irony in the scholars' honouring of Faustus's body after death, for Marlowe has shown his readers not just an overreaching scholar but a miserable fool. The "mangled limbs," "All torn asunder by the hand of death," which are given "due burial" by the scholars (xx.17, 7), seem symbolic of those dismembered classical texts that Faustus himself swore to master. And the motto appended to the play, even if it is the work of an anonymous printer (as Greg believes), is a wonderfully apt embodiment of that tragic law whereby Marlowe has mangled his hero: "Terminat hora diem; terminat Author opus." As the hour ends the day, and as time marches on, so the author ends his work. But who is the "Author" alluded to in this final line: Marlowe, or his Faustus? The Prologue to Dr. Faustus, which places the play in the context of the Marlovian canon, explicitly suggests Marlowe's own involvement in what Ribner calls the most terribly personal of all Marlowe's plays" ("Marlowe's 'Tragicke Glasse'" 110). But even without the Prologue's metafictional beginning, this final Latin motto would be enough to link author and hero together forever in their defiance of literary authority.

Notes

[1] In the terms of Renaissance literary theory, Marlowe is like a little god who creates his own brave new world in the literary universe, but for a Renaissance poet that creation can never be conceived _ex nihilo_. Marlowe can boldly go into comic regions where Musaeus has not gone before, yet his poem, as we have seen, still reveres classical authority.

[2] At the outset, it must be admitted that many readers would contest the attribution of heroism or active rebellion to Faustus. Focussing on Faustus's folly and hedonistic degeneration throughout the play and on the moral import of his final damnation, critics such as Leo Kirschbaum claim, "Whatever Marlowe was himself, there is no more obvious Christian document in all Elizabethan drama than _Doctor Faustus_" (229). Kirschbaum's reexamination of the Helen of Troy speech (xviii.99-118) leads him to conclude that, far from being an "unencumbered pagan paean," the speech is consonant with the rest of the play: Faustus is revealed as "wholly egocentric" (231), "self-deluded, foolishly boastful" (233), an "unstable, foolish worldling" (240). Kirschbaum stresses the play "as a quasi-morality in which is clearly set forth the hierarchy of moral values which enforces and encloses the play, which the characters in the play accept. . . ." (229); and yet

his argument merely repeats the lessons of the Old Man, the Good Angel, and the orthodox Chorus. The moralistic reading of Dr. Faustus ignores the dialogical nature of the drama, as well as the lyrical beauty of the poetry, which serves to emphasize Faustus's heroic potential. Indeed, as Nicholas Brooke points out, those who interpret Dr. Faustus as a straightforward morality play ignore the finest poetic passages, which express "superbly a longing for knowledge, beauty, wealth and power" (666) and suggest a satiric counter-message "against the declared Christian moral" (668). Even more convincingly, recent critics point to the unresolvable ambiguity in the play: Dollimore shows that Dr. Faustus is an "interrogative text" that vindicates neither Faustus the overreaching hero nor the morality structure that ultimately condemns him (118); and Barber finds that the play expresses "not a single point of view but unresolved tensions--unresolved except by tragedy" (Wheeler 15). Marlowe's version of the Faust legend is "irreducibly dramatic" (Barber 88): it demands to be experienced as a tragedy that problematizes the categories of good and evil, not paraphrased as a morality. Faustus as tragic hero clearly exhibits the tension between heroic ambition and ironic failure. Even the Prologue points to the inherent ambivalence fostered by the play, for it ambiguously promises to "perform / The form of Faustus' fortunes, good or bad" (7-8).

[3] In both Dido and Dr. Faustus, the law of de casibus tragedy, the obligatory rule that the protagonist must die, is enforced through literary authority, namely, the "authorial" precedent of Virgil (in Dido's case), and of humanistic scholars, as well as Christ and St. Paul (in Faustus's case). For a cultural materialist reading of Faustus's relation to the ideological constructs of "law" and "authority," see Dollimore's Radical Tragedy. Placing Dr. Faustus in the context of the radical subversions or "refusals" of Jacobean tragedy, Dollimore argues that the sacred, against which Faustus transgresses, outwardly manifests itself as law but is subversively revealed as a "limiting structure" of authoritarian power (118).

[4] For discussions of Marlowe's mock heroic treatment of Virgil, see Gill, "Marlowe's Virgil," and her introduction to Dido. Gibbons also shows that Marlowe treats "Aeneas, a very type of the Renaissance hero, with sardonic irreverence": "By interweaving Virgil and Lydgate Marlowe fuses contradictory attitudes to Aeneas, and Aeneas himself is consequently radically unstable, Protean: a hero, a wretched and impotent coward, a tragic victim of destiny" (41).

[5] Blackburn argues that Faustus's "failure to master the power that language provides" destroys him, despite his "great promise and noble aspiration" (12). Faustus is a poor scholar and an inept magician whose "attempt at conjuring is utter nonsense" (Blackburn 5), when compared

to Renaissance discussions of magic such as Pico's _Oration on the Dignity of Man_ (1486).

[6] In his discussion of the much debated references to "widow Dido" in Shakespeare's _Tempest_, Kott suggests that Renaissance allusions to Virgil's classic, like Scriptural allusions, constitute "metalingual" signs (107) which are ideologically charged: "the _Aeneid_ existed not only as a text and its successive translations. Not unlike the Bible it shaped the cultural and literary consciousness of the West for centuries. It was at the same time text and _lectio_. . . ." (108).

[7] See Richard F. Hardin for cogent evidence that Faustus's relation to "[t]he fruitful plot of scholarism" (Prol. 16) mirrors Marlowe's experiences at Cambridge: indeed, several Marlovian tragedies "consider the tragic opposition between hope and actuality, between the life of the mind and that of the world" (390-91). Lisa Jardine and Hugh Kearney more fully explore the curriculum and social status of the university in English society.

[8] Harry Levin's _Overreacher_, regarded by many critics as "[a]rguably the single most important critical study of Marlowe" since 1950 (Friedenreich, _Bibliography_ 54), stresses the effectiveness of "the mighty line" in reinforcing Marlowe's overreaching imagery, so that the Marlovian stage "becomes a vehicle for hyperbole" (24).

[9] The Massacre at Paris is only an apparent exception, since Henslowe in his Diary lists it as The Guise. See Harry Levin 84.

[10] All quotations from Dr. Faustus refer to the Revels edition, edited by Jump, which provides detailed commentary as well as a helpful appendix containing the most important passages of the Damnable Life. Jump's edition is based on the B-text (1616), rather than on the truncated A-text (1604): see the excellent summary of the history of the text (xxiv-xxxii). W. W. Greg's important parallel text edition, which weighs the merits of both texts, ends by conjecturing that the B-text may have been set from "a manuscript containing the author's drafts" (vii). I find the comic scenes, whose authorship has been much debated, consonant with Marlowe's parodic impulse elsewhere.

[11] Contemporary records such as Baines' note and Kyd's letter to Sir John Puckering, the Lord Keeper, strongly suggest that this struggle against authority fascinated Marlowe himself: Kyd reports that it was Marlowe's "custom" "to jest at the devine scriptures[,] gybe at praiers, & stryve in argument to frustrate & confute what hath byn spoke or wrytt by prophets & such holie menn"; Baines writes of Marlowe's "damnable Iudgment of Religion,and scorn of Gods word" (qtd. in Steane 7, 363; cf. Boas, Christopher Marlowe 245-50). If these testimonies of Marlowe's irreverence for authority remain somewhat

suspicious, as a University Wit he would have been well versed in religious controversy; and his plays bear out the struggle of the author (or our construct of the author) against authority. Critics such as Constance Kuriyama have connected Marlowe's fascination throughout his oeuvre with overthrowing (paternal) authority to his personal attempts to resolve his own psychic conflict (Hammer). However, if we leave the arena of psychological speculation and focus more squarely on the structural patterns in the plays themselves, we may learn more about the indirect means by which Marlowe as Renaissance writer works out his peculiar conflict with literary authority.

[12] For Ben Jonson's famous allusion to "Marlowes mighty line," see the Herford and Simpson edition XI, 145. Riddell offers a useful discussion of Jonson's balanced opinion of Marlowe.

[13] J. W. Ashton argues that long before the sixteenth century, Icarus served as a "symbol of that rash and headlong attempt to fly too high" (153), but that Renaissance humanists appropriate the classical figure to underscore the dangers inherent in the alchemical search for the secrets of the universe. Following the historical example of the famous Dr. John Dee, Marlowe's Faustus, Greene's Friar Bacon, and Shakespeare's Prospero "are symbols of the disadvantages, even the tragedies, that may arise from this too searching inquiry after a wisdom that

is no wisdom" (157).

[14] Kerrigan explains that in the Renaissance "artistic originality had yet to distance itself from influence" (273). For Kerrigan, "humanist imitation is a kind of grammar for the restraint of the creative act, a way of generating the novel from the prior with maximum stability. Through the exercises of _copia_, resemblance itself has been positioned in a temporal order, the whole heft of the concept of imitation is toward veneration and precedence, forming the new _from_, and not _alongside_, the fixed ideal of the classical original" (272). Kerrigan finds in Renaissance writers a "happy poise between worship for the past and ambition for the future, the awareness of having been preceded balancing, rather than straining against, the determination to excel" (276). Although Kerrigan argues that Renaissance writers do not exhibit "the ambivalent dynamics of the oppressed son" (275), his excellent description of the primacy of classical "originals" suggests that a writer like Marlowe might indeed exhibit some form of literary rebellion. At least, Kerrigan supports the comparison of the link between original and translation to a relationship between father and son: Cinthio, revealingly, calls a good imitation "the son of the father" (272).

[15] See Gill's studies of Marlowe's Lucan: "Marlowe, Lucan, and Sulpitius"; and of Marlowe's Elegies: "'Snakes Leape by Verse.'" See also Steane 249-301.

[16] By contrast, Shapiro argues that Marlowe follows the tradition "of poets undertaking laborious translations in their maturity" (324) and probably wrote his translation of the Pharsalia after Edward II. Shapiro points out that, because Marlowe's Lucan was entered posthumously with Hero and Leander in the Stationer's Register, both poems may have been composed during 1592-93, during the closing of the theatres due to plague.

[17] Ardolino shows that in The Spanish Tragedy, Edward II, and Hamlet, deadly letters serve as ironic revealers of truth (100).

[18] Lest we puzzle or hesitate over Bakhtin's neglect of drama, or over his transference of dramatic effects to the novel, students of Renaissance drama should recall the impoverishment of Bakhtin's Russian literary heritage. Because "Russia had really never known a genuinely popular theatrical tradition," "some explanation for Bakhtin's generic confusion can be found within his cultural context" (Wise 21). Wise perceptively argues that Bakhtin, ignoring the material differences between the novel and drama, naively bases his theory of the novel on a "phenomenology of performance" (21) that properly applies to drama.

[19]The extent of Marlowe's parody here becomes clear when we compare his version of the scene between Jupiter and Venus with Venus's reverent supplication in Virgil's Aeneid: Venus begins her speech, "My lord who rule / The lives of men and gods now and forever, / And bring them all to heel with your bright bolt" (II.312-14).

[20]The impulse that turns Jupiter into a flirtatious lover is, of course, Ovidian; in Ovid's Metamorphoses, the god often appears undignified, as at the end of Book II, when he adopts the guise of a bull to court Europa: "Majesty and love go ill together, nor can they long share one abode. Abandoning the dignity of his sceptre, the father and ruler of the gods, whose hand wields the flaming three-forked bolt, whose nod shakes the universe, adopted the guise of a bull. . . ." (Innes 72). Golding's translation less explicitly reports Jupiter's loss of dignity during amorous exploits; but Marlowe was clearly acquainted with Ovid's deflation of Jupiter's regal stature, for he quotes the first line of this passage in Edward II. Although Ovid infuses the tone of Dido, Marlowe's final citations of Virgil suggest that he is playing off the Ovidian against the Virgilian (much as in Hero and Leander he sets Ovid against Musaeus). See Cole 84-85.

[21] For a valuable discussion of the ambiguity of "masculine" (pro-duty) and "feminine" (pro-love) elements in the play and in Marlowe criticism, see Deats, "Dialectic" 13-18. Deats connects Marlowe's "dialectic of masculine and feminine" in Dido to the similar gender debate inscribed in Tamburlaine and Edward II: all three plays "interrogate patriarchal assumptions" (28). Kay Stockholder examines Faustus's relation to women from a psychoanalytic perspective. For more general discussions of Marlowe's dramatic treatment of women, see Baines and Richmond.

[22] Montaigne, in a passage of the Essais replete with "sexualogical terms" (Coleman 89; Cave 284-97), indicates the "masculine" qualities of Latin. In "Upon Some Verses of Virgil," Montaigne praises the "naturall and constant vigor" of writers like Lucretius: "The whole composition or text is manly, they are not bebusied about Rhetorike flowers" (III: 100). By implication, contemporary French writers show an effeminacy in their "miserable strained affectation of strange Inke-pot termes" (III: 101).

[23] See Bevington's seminal study of the connection between Dr. Faustus (as well as Tamburlaine, The Jew of Malta, and Edward II) and the earlier Tudor interludes and morality plays. Examining with particular care Tudor conditions of dramatic production, Bevington concludes that in Dr. Faustus Marlowe focussed on Faustus's "human

predicament" and thereby achieved "a vital fusion of secular subject and traditional form."

[24] Critics have variously explained Faustus's inability to repent. For Kirschbaum, it reveals that "sensuous pleasure is always Faustus' remedy for spiritual despair" (237), and the threats of physical torture that keep Faustus from turning to God only remind us that "the obverse of love of pleasure is fear of pain" (237). Rozett situates the play in the context of Calvinist notions of election and damnation: like Tamburlaine and Edward II, Dr. Faustus intensifies the religious anxiety of its Elizabethan audience by evoking an ambivalent response, a mixture of sympathy and condemnation, for its unrepentant hero. My view is more closely aligned with the latter emphasis on the ambivalence created by Marlowe: Faustus is a type of Renaissance man tragically fated to be damned because of his aspirations to power and knowledge. See also Traister's argument that the figure of the magician symbolizes the Renaissance ambivalence towards the limitations of human power: Faustus's career as a magician testifies to the ironic enslavement of human potential.

[25] Compare Milton's Eve: "Greedily she ingorg'd without restraint, / And knew not eating Death" (IX.791-92).

[26] There is general critical consensus that the direct narrative source of Dr. Faustus is P. F.'s "The Historie of the Damnable Life, and Deserued Death of Doctor Iohn Fuastus" (1592), which is itself an English translation of the German Historia von D. Iohan Fausten (1587). John D. Jump, editor of the Revels edition, provides a detailed account of the many episodes from P.F.'s version that Marlowe closely follows. As Jump argues, Marlowe's "close adherence to the wording of the Damnable Life proves that he used P.F.'s English translation in writing Doctor Faustus" (xxxix). Marlowe's dramatic portrait of Faustus relies upon this and other well-known narrative material about the legendary German magician. But it must be remembered that Marlowe's version of the Faust legend is, like Dido, a "dramatic translation."

[27] Calling the play a "tragedy of misreading," Keefer shows that Faustus's distortions of texts, his wrenchings of text out of context, mirror the practice of modern readers, who also reveal ideologically motivated readings.

[28] For deconstructive readings of the "textuality" of Faustus's experience, see Birringer, "Between Body and Language"; and Garber.

[29] Kott sees Agrippa's presence in Dr. Faustus on three different levels: as the character Cornelius, as an historical person, and as a double for Faustus himself (11).

[30] Monica Heller defines the recent term "codeswitching" as "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode" (1). The term, adapted to a literary rather than sociolinguistic context, aptly describes Marlowe's use of Latin and English not only in a single scene but in the communicative episode of both Dido and Dr. Faustus.

[31] The OED records a 1581 entry by one R. Goade: "It is the imperatiue mode and therefore a commaundement" (sb.1).

[32] Compare Nicholas Brooke: "From the dull and feeble bleatings of the Good Angel at the beginning, to the conventional phrases of the Old Man and the Epilogue, all statements of the 'good' moral remain vague, flat, meaningless" ("Moral Tragedy" 669).

[33] See Kott (11) and Bakhtin, Rabelais and His World (86) for further discussions of the Rabelaisian travesty of Consummatum est.

[34] Kuriyama argues that the lack of resolution of the father-son conflict in Dr. Faustus reflects Marlowe's own homosexual anxiety over his masculinity (Hammer 120).

ACT IV

"Stand still you watches of the element": Shortening the Time in Edward II

At the moment of tragic recognition, Faustus encapsulates the Marlovian agon: "O, I'll leap up to my God! Who pulls me down?" (xix.145). Marlowe's tragic protagonists all struggle between the poles of heroic desire and ironic reality. It is the law of tragedy that pulls them down to a world of limitation and mutability, as they strive, like Icarus or Phaeton, to leap up to an eternal unchanging realm of limitless desire. Tragedy, understood in its conventional Renaissance sense, is a moralized narrative structure of rise-and-fall, exemplified by the de casibus strain of the genre.[1] However, as suggested by Harry Levin's comparative plotting of Marlowe's and Shakespeare's plays (188-89), Marlovian tragedy is distinctive for its focus on the rising movement. Even the most conventional of Marlowe's plot-structures, that of Edward II, features a meteoric rise through ambition, in the character of Mortimer. And yet in all Marlowe's plays, the law of tragedy dictates the fall of the aspiring protagonist, and hence the triumph of social mores over the eccentric individual, of paternal authority over filial rebellion, and above all of the forces of mutability over the effort to "be eterniz'd," as

Faustus puts it (i.15). The causal law of tragedy is thus not only social or moral but, ultimately, temporal. It is the law of human existence, that whatever is born shall die, and the most reductive of all human lessons, as Baldock points out in Edward II: "all live to die, and rise to fall" (IV.vi.111).[2]

Through the downward pull of tragedy (what we might call the gravitational law of the genre), Marlowe invariably thwarts his protagonists' rising aspirations. Yet, before he finally pulls them down, Marlowe allows some of his saltatory protagonists a longer dalliance than others. The pleasure of Marlowe's tragic text lies in its deferral of the hero's expected fall. The previous chapters of this study, which have explored Marlowe's agonistic relation to his sources through his characteristic technique of dilation, have implicitly traced the modal differences, or the play of differance, in Marlowe's varying uses of tragedy. My generic reading of Marlowe's relation to the de casibus model of tragedy cannot help but evoke the notion of differance, that is, of the simultaneous deferral and difference of meaning between the de casibus "original" (the generic Signified) and the Marlovian "imitation" (the wandering signifier).[3] Though Marlowe's plays inscribe de casibus convention, their radical mutations (accomplished through the use of other generic models, through the insistent presence of parody, and through the refusal to moralize) attest both to the central importance of, and the slippage of meaning between, tradition and the individual talent. The Derridean neologism subversively infiltrates a generic study of Marlovian dilation, by pointing to the semantic play between differing and deferral and reminding us that any act of (textual) signification constitutes an endless play of meanings or traces. And yet Marlowe's tragedies themselves foreground the dialectical play between the binary oppositions of (romantic) dilation and (tragic) death, or between heroic desire and ironic reality.

Marlowe's experimentations in tragedy run the gamut of the genre, from "high romance to bitter and ironic realism" (Frye, Anatomy 162).[4] To move from Tamburlaine and Dido to Dr. Faustus and Edward II involves a readjustment of perspective away from the heroic mode of the former plays to the more ironic mode of the latter. In his most heroic tragedies, Marlowe dilates his protagonists' desire for earthly delights, thus postponing their fall. Even Faustus dallies in sensual pleasures until his midnight hour. But Edward II, a "play of limitation and constraint" (Kuriyama 176), cuts short the dilatory moment of sensual pleasure.[5]

Rather than dilate the romantic episodes, Marlowe contracts the dalliance between the lovers Edward and Gaveston. Telescoping the historical sources, notably Holinshed, Marlowe not only shortens or deforms the chronological time of Edward's reign but also develops a tightly woven network of symbols that suggest the cyclical nature of tragic time. In this way, he establishes the play's ironic mode of bondage and constriction, that is, the contraction of the protagonist's desire. If we understand genre as a grammar of typical plot-structures, we might say that in Edward II Marlowe focusses on the period of the tragic sentence--to recall Baldock's mouthing of the tragic sententia, on the falling action consequent on the rising impulse.

At first glance, Edward II appears the most orthodox of all Marlowe's tragedies, that is, the most readerly of his texts. Instead of playing with our expectations by deferring Edward's fall, Marlowe makes death imminent (and immanent) throughout the play. Edward II presents a virtually reversed image of Tamburlaine, matching that play's outrageous dilation with a seemingly orthodox contraction of historical materials into the shape of de casibus tragedy. But, as we shall see, the pleasure of Edward II lies precisely in this technique of contraction, which serves (no less than the dilatory technique in Tamburlaine and Hero and Leander) to tantalize the reader. The pleasure of Tamburlaine arises from the hero's awe-inspiring conquest of social mores, including the limitations of language and class, and the temporal boundary imposed by the conventional reading of history;

the play asks us to delight in Tamburlaine's successful violation of social convention (as encoded in the narrative convention of de casibus tragedy), not in his eventual submission as death claims him. In Edward II, rather than detailing the career of another shepherd who would be king, Marlowe begins with its daring reverse--a king who would be shepherd. Yet the twist can be seen as an equally ironic subversion of de casibus conventions, which presuppose that those who fall on Fortune's wheel exhibit the sin of usurping ambition. Of all Marlowe's heroes, Edward seems the least overreaching. Because of the power vacuum created by his obsessive private affair with Gaveston, Edward becomes an instant victim in the play, so that from the first act onward we begin to watch for his death.

To speak of Marlowe's contraction or dilation of his protagonists' desire is to focus on the temporal dimension of his tragedies. As Tom F. Driver points out, "drama, above all other arts, is the temporal art," since it "is the only art that is performed" (thereby depending upon rhythm and duration) "and that also may speak of time as a subject" ("The Shakespearian Clock" 363). But beyond drama's general ability to use the element of time both formally and thematically, each specific form of drama takes a distinct view towards time.[6] Driver, like other critics, too quickly passes over the special relationship that obtains between time and the tragic hero.

Tragedy presents us with a radical, existential view of time, as a devourer that destroys individuality. Tragic heroes are victims or "fools of time," in Frye's formulation, who struggle against time, unable to synchronize themselves with the natural order. We can fruitfully apply Granville-Barker's phrase "tragedy of precipitate action" (which Driver agrees effectively describes Romeo and Juliet) to the genre as a whole. If, as Frye suggests, the tragic hero is like "a man who deliberately jumps off a precipice," for whom "the law of gravitation acts as fate for the brief remainder of his life" (Anatomy 212), every tragedy can be considered a "tragedy of precipitate action." Conventional tragic protagonists seem to hurl themselves headlong in an inexorable chain of fatal circumstance, because they are trapped in a time that is, to echo Hamlet, "out of joint" (I.v.188).

In his dramatic translation of Holinshed (and of other scattered historical sources), Marlowe makes history the fallen world of time from which Edward cannot escape. Not only are moral antitheses hopelessly blurred in Edward's world, but language no longer carries immortalizing power. Marlowe offers Edward no chance to rise above the fallen world, to dilate the inexorable march of time. The Renaissance saw love and poetry as the two immortalizing forces that could combat the ravages of time (Peterson 15).

But, in contrast with the other tragic heroes we have studied so far, Marlowe compensates Edward neither with the sweetness of a prolonged lovers' dalliance nor with a shattering, memorializing eloquence. For Edward even the crown becomes, not the "perfect bliss and sole felicity, /The sweet fruition" that it is for Tamburlaine (1.II.vii.28-9), but rather a death-dealing circle, a sign not of eternity but of temporal limit or circumscription. This chapter explores the neglected significance of Edward's, and Marlowe's, relationship with this temporal limit that is so central to tragedy, especially to an ironic tragedy, like Edward II, that inclines towards the history play (Ribner, English History Play 127-29).

i.

All of Marlowe's overreaching protagonists strive to escape time, the most fundamental human element, but by the law of tragedy time and death conquer every one. Yet Marlowe endows some of his heroes with a measure of heroic, superhuman power capable of extending or dilating time--whether it be the time needed for a lovers' dalliance (as with Dido) or for continued conquest (as with Tamburlaine). While stretching the boundaries of time, these heroes almost seem to seat themselves in heaven and rival the gods. Tamburlaine continually threatens to ascend to heaven and pull Jove down from his throne; and he comes close to convincing us that he can, since he has mastered that "great and thund'ring speech" (1.I.i.3) that eludes Mycetes, the weak-king prototype of Marlowe's Edward. Furthermore, Dido compares her dalliance with Aeneas to that between Jove and Ganymede, for it has the power to raise her above time, as she states: "For in his looks I see eternity, / And he'll make me immortal with a kiss" (IV.iv.122-3). Aeneas's kiss may ultimately be deadly, yet it succeeds, paradoxically, in giving Dido a kind of immortality, as Marlowe's metafictional citation of Virgil at the end of the play reminds us. Dido is immortalized, through Virgil's (and Marlowe's) poetry.

Faustus, from his opening soliloquy onwards, searches for some way to "be eterniz'd" (i.15). He wishes he could "make men to live eternally / Or being dead raise them to life again" (i.24-25), but the immovable obstacle, human mortality, remains: "Yet art thou still but Faustus, and a man" (i.23). The demonic attraction of the spirit of Helen of Troy lies in her promise (however illusory) of immortality. In what has become one of the most famous speeches of Dr. Faustus, Marlowe emphasizes Faustus's own tortured relationship with time and eternity when he has his hero echo Dido:

> Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships
> And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?
> Sweet Helen, make me immortal with a kiss.

(xviii.99-101; my emphasis)

Faustus's love-affair with the wraith of Helen of Troy is of course highly parodic: he calls her "Brighter. . . than flaming Jupiter" (V.i.114), and blasphemously claims that "heaven is in these lips" (104), but "Her lips suck forth . . . [his] soul" (102).

Although Faustus and Dido, through language, both exhibit a heroic defiance of authority, Faustus as ironic hero suggests even closer connections with Edward, especially in his relation to time and eternity. Indeed, at the moment of tragic anagnorisis, Marlowe has both Edward and Faustus apostrophize the heavenly orbs that control time. These extraordinarily similar passages in Dr. Faustus and Edward II show Marlowe, through his characteristic habit of self-quotation, conventionalizing the tragic protagonist's relation to time. Our study of temporal contraction, the formal and thematic centre of Edward II, can best begin by examining these parallel passages, as no critic has adequately done.[7]

ii.

By contrast with the more romantic moments in his heroic tragedies, where time seems to stand still in deference to immortalizing love or to the "immortal flowers of poesy" (Tamburlaine 1.V.i.166), time rushes on in Marlowe's ironic tragedies, to effect the hero's destruction. In Words With Power, Northrop Frye, whose description of tragedy's modal transformations has proven helpful for an understanding of Marlowe, provides a corresponding scheme of the various modal categories of time. With considerable relevance for Marlowe's plays, Frye categorizes time according to its relation to the individual's fulfillment of desire. Heavenly time is epiphanic, the "total 'now' or real present"; unfallen time appears as "exuberance or inner energy," represented by "music, dance, play"; fallen or ordinary time is experienced as "linear and cyclical," "a partly alienating then"; and, most importantly for our consideration of Dr. Faustus and Edward II, demonic time is felt as "pure duration and power of annihilation" (179). This last ironic experience of time divests the ordinary experience of clock-time of any upward movement that might "bring a temporary, or time-dominated, sense of the exuberance and gaiety of the world above" (177). As Frye explains, "In demonic time all cyclical movement is seen as closed and completed, and we have only repetition of the same thing, or the same kind of thing," as in Macbeth's chilling invocation of a time that offers no redemption: "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow / Creeps in this petty pace from day to day, / To the last syllable of recorded time" (V.v.19-21).

Critical discussions of time in Shakespeare affirm the value of Frye's schematization. Quinones, for instance, argues that, for Renaissance writers in general and Shakespeare in particular, "Victory over time is the measure of their heroism" (3). If Prince Hal learns how to redeem time, or manage it wisely, for Richard II "time is an article of limitation as well as accusation" (Quinones 304).[8] In fact, Quinones perceptively links Richard with Marlowe's Edward and Faustus as prisoners of time:[9]

> Fatherless tragic sons, Richard II, Edward II, and we can include Faustus here, who turned his back on his 'base parentage,' have much in common in their fates. They are all joined by the fact that the reality of time is hostile to their expectations and to their aspirations, and that eventually it is the article of limitation that impinges upon the infinitude of their will.
>
> (321)

Like Shakespeare's Richard and Macbeth, both Edward and Faustus feel time as an increasingly constrictive trap and end by wishing in vain that "th' estate o' th' world were now undone" (Mac. V.v.49).

At the conclusion of Dr. Faustus, and throughout Edward II, Marlowe creates a world governed by "demonic time," where the dominant impression is the horror of "one clock-tick after another, an unending duration without direction or purpose" (Frye, "Rhythms of Time" 158).

Faustus gains eternity, but it is the eternity of hell, where the order of time, far from being transcended or transformed, becomes instead the most salient sign of the bondage and torture of the damned. Faustus's long final soliloquy begins by focussing on the inescapable revolutions of the natural order that demand his damnation:

> Ah, Faustus,
> Now hast thou but one bare hour to live,
> And then thou must be damn'd perpetually.
> Stand still, you ever-moving spheres of heaven,
> That time may cease, and midnight never come;
> Fair nature's eye, rise, rise again, and make
> Perpetual day; or let this hour be but
> A year, a month, a week, a natural day,
> That Faustus may repent and save his soul.
> *O lente lente currite noctis equi*!
> The stars move still, time runs, the clock will
> strike,
> The devil will come, and Faustus must be damn'd.
> (xix.133-45)

The Marlovian hell, that "vast perpetual torture-house" (xix.117), becomes a parody of the perpetual motion of the stars and planets, the "ever-moving spheres" which by their very nature cannot "Stand still." The perpetuity of hell--the fact that Faustus will "be damn'd perpetually," or continuously--is its chief horror; and Faustus's most coveted fantasy, immortality, has become his most chilling nightmare.

Faustus has revelled in night, coveting the dilation of his solipsistic love-affair with his own appetite for forbidden knowledge (symbolized by the insubstantial ghost of Helen of Troy). But now Faustus's parodic prayer that "time may cease, and midnight never come," that the sun make "Perpetual day," ironically reverses his earlier sworn allegiance to the demonic forces of night, led by Lucifer, "Chief lord and regent of perpetual night" (v.56). His damnation, which was sealed at "midnight" (v.29), has come full circle to this "sick hour which his surfeit made" (R2 II.ii.84).

Like Marlowe's Edward and Shakespeare's Richard, Faustus belongs to the ironic mode of tragedy, where "we have the sense of looking down on a scene of bondage, frustration, or absurdity" (Frye, Anatomy 34). However, Marlowe endows his Magus with a potential for heroism that is almost invisible in his weak king, Edward. The language of poetry (in the form of Ovid's immortal, incantatory line) seems to offer Faustus a last vestige of heroic, if twisted, defiance against the forces of time; yet it becomes clear in the final soliloquy that time is Faustus's chief, invincible antagonist. Marlowe makes the clock, with its insistent, merciless striking, akin to a physical character, against which Faustus rages but to which he must finally submit.

The clock, invented in the late thirteenth century to keep time in increasingly pressured Renaissance urban centres, is a sign of the newly mechanistic culture of humanism, that culture which has throughout the play been complicit in Faustus's downfall as a scholar.[10] Just as the "jaws of hell" (xix.15) open, preparing to receive Faustus, a stage direction indicates that "*The clock strikes eleven*." Only thirty-one lines later, another stage direction specifies, "*The watch strikes*," and Faustus despairs, "Ah, half the hour is pass'd: 'twill all be pass'd anon" (xix.164). The time for negotiation having expired, a third stage direction states, a mere nineteen lines later, "*The clock striketh twelve*"; Faustus cries, "O, it strikes, it strikes!" (183). Against Faustus's defiant attempts first to stop his remaining "one bare hour" (134), and then to extend it into a longer interval (he would settle for a mere "natural day" [140]), Marlowe ironically sets a tyrannical clock-time that now seems to contract, not dilate.

In engineering clock-time as the antagonist that pulls Faustus down, Marlowe telescopes time to gain greater psychological effect. The line "A year, a month, a week, a natural day" nicely embodies the telescopic effect of the entire soliloquy. Yet this contraction is dramatically effective only because most of the play, from the signing of Faustus's contract with Lucifer onward, has focussed on the twenty-four-year period of dalliance, for whose illusory pleasures Faustus exchanges his soul. The stroke of midnight, when he both signs away and forfeits his soul, constitutes the reality that Faustus has avoided. This is the moment of consummation, which Faustus has himself "contracted" in advance, the demonic epiphany towards which Marlowe's tragedy has moved from the beginning. The reader feels a tortured bliss in reaching it.

In Faustus's final soliloquy, Marlowe makes use, in miniature, of the celebrated Renaissance technique of "double time." Despite the clear references to chronological time in the stage directions, we experience with Faustus not the "real" time of an hour but, in the words of one nineteenth-century Shakespearean critic, "a false show of time, to the utmost contracted."[11] The counterfeit representation of time in Renaissance literature, which Puttenham describes by the device of "cronographia," is of course widespread.[12] As Mable Buland has shown, Shakespeare learns the dramatic technique of "double time" from his Elizabethan predecessors, notably Marlowe. Although she helpfully outlines this temporal convention in plays of the period, Buland fails to show its significance. Dealing with Shakespearean tragedy, for example, she notes only that "for some reason, mere rapidity of movement seemed to Shakespeare eminently desirable" (124). The reason for the telescoping or contraction of time, especially at the moment of tragic recognition, is, however, clear: it increases our sense of the tragic heroes' helplessness in the face of the real, inevitable forces of mutability that dictate their downfall.

iii.

For Edward as well as for Faustus, death presents itself as an inevitable event in the larger cycles of mutability and decay. Nevertheless, Edward's apostrophe to the heavenly forces of time, though echoing Faustus's speech, lacks the intense extremes of heroic dilation and ironic contraction that characterize Faustus's situation. Tragedy's law of eternal recurrence has governed Edward II from the outset; dalliance cannot survive in Edward's world, where all is pulled down to the monotonous plane of irony. In the final act of the play, Marlowe has one of Edward's captors, Matrevis, unwittingly sum up the play's dominant attitude towards dalliance and dilation: "dalliance dangereth our lives" (V.iii.3). Whereas Faustus dallies in earthly delights for twenty-four years--or twelve scenes--Edward is allowed uninterrupted dalliance with Gaveston merely for the first three scenes of the play. And a precarious, ill-fated dalliance it is: in the opening scene, Gaveston has just been called back from banishment in France; by I.iv he has again been banished; and, though Isabella's contrivances with Mortimer succeed in revoking that banishment, Gaveston's enemies clearly consent to repeal him "only to work his overthrow" (I.iv.262). For the remainder of the play, Gaveston's impending destruction overshadows all of the king's encounters with his favourite.

Severely attenuating Edward's possibilities of dilating his love-affair with Gaveston, Marlowe contracts his protagonist's desire very early on in the play. By the time he apostrophizes time's forces, the resigned Edward shows little rebellion against time through language. Edward's time-keeper--the sun, not the mechanical clock--is a fitting reminder of nature's inexorable cycles of mutability and decay. Faustus's apostrophe to the heavenly spheres exhibits a metre more varied than that of Edward's similar apostrophe; in Edward II, even the regularity of Marlowe's verse (an iambic pentameter that varies the iamb in three places at the most [lines 59, 66, and perhaps 60]), suggests Edward's inability to break out of the ironic repetitive cycles of his world:

> But stay awhile, let me be king till night,
> That I may gaze upon this glittering crown;
> So shall my eyes receive their last content,
> My head, the latest honour due to it,
> And jointly both yield up their wished right.

> Continue ever thou celestial sun;
> Let never silent night possess this clime:
> Stand still you watches of the element;
> All times and seasons, rest you at a stay,
> That Edward may be still fair England's king.
> But day's bright beams doth vanish fast away,
> And needs I must resign my wished crown.
>
> (V.i.59-70)

Thus constrained by inability to use language in a Faustian way--defiantly and heroically--Edward's attempts to extend his remaining minutes of nominal power are much feebler than Faustus's, though the weak king also desires to stall "times and seasons." Faustus's more forceful use of language is conveyed through the recurrence of harsh voiced consonants, notably "p," and "k" (or hard "c"). Edward, on the other hand, conspicuously uses the voiceless "b" and "d," and "g." In _Edward II_, Marlowe thus cuts short the dilatory impulse, transmitted through language, at the crucial moment of tragic recognition, as he has throughout the play. The natural cycles that Edward longs to control are the very cycles that demand his destruction, that bring night out of day and death out of life.

Edward shares Faustus's ironic wish, if not its expression, for "Perpetual day." The use of sun-imagery is as appropriate in the story of the historical monarch as in that of the wayward magician, for both fear the midnight hour to which they have in a sense devoted themselves from the outset. Yet in the syntax of Edward's speech, both the crown and the sun symbolically merge into one sign of his *de jure* kingship. The "glittering crown" that he longs to gaze on "till night" seems one with the "celestial sun" that he exhorts to "[c]ontinue" so that he may "be king till night." It is thus not surprising that the vanishing of daylight coincides with Edward's resignation of his crown.

In *Edward II*, Marlowe exploits the conventional associations of sun-imagery in the contemporary history-play tradition. Other sixteenth-century history plays use the sun, particularly as it appears in the myth of Phaeton, to symbolize misguided kingship. Not only does Phaeton--that rash son who tried to control the sun's chariot--become the conventional symbol of weak kingship, but the throne (in typological terms, the chariot that Phaeton rides) becomes associated with the sun. Norton and Sackville make the association explicit in *Gorboduc*: "Lo such are they now in the royall throne / As was rashe Phaeton in Phebus carre" (II.i). The sun serves as an apt symbol for Shakespeare's Richard II, especially since it was the Yorkist badge:[13] during his downfall, Richard compares himself to "glist'ring Phaeton, / Wanting the manage of unruly jades" (II.ii.178-79). But when Marlowe appropriates the symbol (notably in *Tamburlaine* and *Edward*

II) to suggest the dangers of kingship, Phaeton's sun--by a kind of metonymic transfer--comes to symbolize the crown as well as the throne, and even at one point the king himself. Besides making the "celestial sun" that gives Edward his power metaphorically equivalent to the "glittering crown," Marlowe slants the conventional use of the Phaeton-myth when Mortimer's follower the Earl of Warwick compares Edward to the sun and Gaveston to an "Ignoble vassal, that like Phaeton / Aspir'st unto the guidance of the sun" (I.iv.16-17). Once Mortimer effectively divests him of his royal power, Edward becomes a mere shadow, for "what are kings, when regiment is gone, / But perfect shadows in a sunshine day?" (V.i.26-27). The crown is the adjunct that creates this "sunshine day" for the one who wears it. In an ironic reversal of the image, Edward prays for the heavens to turn his crown "to a blaze of quenchless fire" (V.i.44) on Mortimer's head. Given the play's recurring imagery, the fiery, "glittering" crown evoked by Edward in this deposition speech is a type not only of the flaming crown with which Medea punished Creusa's infidelity with Jason, but also of the scorching sun that destroyed Phaeton.

The image of the sun clearly carries special cultural significance in the context of Edward II, oriented as the play is toward the history-play genre. The sun is an apt symbol not just of royalty (as in its conventional usage) but also of the rise-and-fall cycles of de casibus tragedy. Moreover, a reader familiar with the conventions of Marlowe's private mythology will overlay the image with additional significance. The Marlovian agon to dilate time translates into a struggle to harness and rein in the power of the sun.[14] Faced with the imminence of their own fall, Marlowe's heroes long for the mythical power exercized by Jupiter when he held back dawn's horses in order to prolong his night of passion with Alcmena. Hence the sun becomes Marlowe's private symbol for the heroic impulse, and his protagonists' dying desire to stall the sun affords them a measure of heroic dignity.

Edward is nonetheless undignified and unheroic for most of the play, and in many respects the lyrical self-possession hinted at in his final speeches takes us by surprise. The king does not hold the balance of power in Edward II; ironically, the hero does not even hold the balance of power in the play.[15] In contrast to Dr. Faustus, where Faustus himself dominates the brilliant, incantatory opening scene, Edward II begins not with Edward's words but rather with Gaveston's, or rather (ironically) with Gaveston's quotation of a letter from Edward.[16] It is Gaveston, not Edward, who is compared to traditional fallen-king types: not just Phaeton but also Caesar (I.i.171-4).[17] In many ways, Gaveston and Mortimer seem the true overreachers in the play, rather than Edward himself. Admittedly, Edward, like Marlowe's other overreachers, has a reach that exceeds his grasp, for he exercises a willfulness that goes beyond a king's prescribed limits. But in coveting an uninterrupted dalliance with Gaveston, Edward seems to reach not up but down, seeking to enjoy the private pleasures of men not constrained by the inherited duties of kingship.[18]

Edward's forced abdication in V.i, and his symbolic conquest by the forces of night that rob him of his "sunshine day" of kingship, therefore merely actualize an impulse that he manifests from the beginning of the play. Indeed, in the opening scene Edward admits to Gaveston, "but to honour thee, / Is Edward pleased with kingly regiment" (I.i.165). And, as early as I.iv, he offers to parcel out his kingdom: "So I may have some nook or corner left, / To frolic with my dearest Gaveston" (I.iv.72-3). Marlowe's conversion of the Phaeton-figure to a symbol that describes the king's favourite rather than the king is apt, for Gaveston, not Edward, effectually sways the balance of royal power. Edward from the outset has given up the power of the sun.

More precisely, the power of the sun in Edward II is tenuous, merely transitory, and the lesson of the play a cautionary one, reminiscent of the Mirror tradition: the sun also sets. In this play, Marlowe associates the fiery orb both with the heroic impulse that can combat time, and with the natural cycles of destruction that mow down all would-be heroes. In order to focus on the falling movement of _de casibus_ tragedy, Marlowe shows the sun at the nadir of its progress (given the human perspective) from zenith to horizon. Of course, two of the central matrices of Renaissance tragedy known to Marlowe, the _Mirror for Magistrates_ and Seneca's plays, use the metaphor of revolution to describe the fall of the hero. In the _Mirror_ tradition, cycles of revolution provide a means of structuring the vast compendium of English histories. Seneca connects the sun's heavenly movement with the tragic hero's earthly progress. In _Edward II_, Marlowe uses the well-known motto from Seneca's _Thyestes_, at the point where Edward's ultimate degradation through torture becomes imminent. Leicester, who has come "in Isabella's name" (IV.vi.64) to arrest Edward's followers for treason and conduct the king to Killingworth, voices the Thyestean motto: "Too true it is, _Quem dies vidit veniens superbum_, / _Hunc dies vidit fugiens jacentem_" (IV.vi.53-54). Since day, coming or fleeing, sees the hero's fall, that fall becomes connected with the sun's own supposed "revolutions." Just as the rising sun eventually sets on the horizon, the exalted one is soon laid low.

Marlowe develops the metaphor of revolution to describe the tragic cycles in the play, particularly those of Edward, Gaveston, and Mortimer. While citing the

Thyestean motto, for example, Leicester ironically foreshadows Mortimer's fall. Though he points to Edward as the one whom the day now sees dejected, only two lines earlier Leicester had testified to Mortimer's exalted state: "What cannot gallant Mortimer with the queen?" (50). By his own Senecan logic, Leicester implies Mortimer's soon dejection, even though it is Edward who visibly begins to "droop" (60).

The play throughout insists on the imminent falls of Edward and Gaveston. Indeed, Marlowe connects the two characters' subjection to the temporal law of tragedy by having them closely echo each other at the moment when each is apprehended by Mortimer's forces. Their parallel speeches further develop the play's central metaphor of revolution but require detailed textual analysis because of their elliptical nature. Edward's speech, in which he apostrophizes day, anticipates his abdication scene:

> O day! the last of all my bliss on earth,
> Centre of all misfortune! O my stars!
> Why do you lour unkindly on a king?
>
> (IV.vi.61-62)

Critics puzzling over Marlowe's unusual word "Centre" here have not adequately explained it. Editors have rightly located the word in the specialized domain of astronomy, but their definition fails to make sense of the passage or to illuminate the motifs in the play as a whole. It is unclear, for example, how Edward intends "centre" to mean "The middle of the earth, which was supposed to be the fixed centre of the universe" (Charlton and Waller 138n5). The two appositives in Edward's apostrophe to day clearly modify "day," not "earth"; it is "day" that seems the "Centre of all misfortune." Surely day cannot be equated with the "middle of the earth." While Marlowe clearly means the word "centre" in its primary sense as the centre of revolution, a more careful reading of the passage would specify the following sense: "The point, pivot, axis, or line round which a body turns or revolves; the fixed or unmoving centre of rotation or revolution" (OED sb.I.4). Edward's apostrophe seems to develop a suggestively Copernican metaphor of the day as an unmoving centre around which bodies revolve. Marlowe may be using "day" as a metonymy for the sun, since "day" signifies "The time of sunlight," that is, "'The time between the rising and setting of the sun' . . . when the sun is above the horizon" (OED sb.I.1). To extend the metaphor into the play's tragic context, the sun (which has symbolized, in the Marlovian transformations of the Icarus or Phaeton myth, the goal of heroism) seems to become the fixed centre around which tragic bodies rise and fall. Edward's day, a "sunshine day" fast dimming, becomes the centre of all revolving misfortune. And Edward himself, positioned "on earth," and calling on his "stars," seems a kind of planetary body, caught in gravitational forces beyond his control.

That Edward II develops revolution as a central metaphor linking the main characters' falls becomes clear when we examine Gaveston's end. Gaveston anticipates Edward's apostrophe to his own last blissful "day" and even more distinctly uses the language of astronomy:

> O, must this day be period of my life?
> Centre of all my bliss!
>
> (III.i.4-5).

Charlton and Waller's gloss on these lines shows that the standard definition of "centre" as "the middle of the earth" obscures more than it illuminates: "Gaveston seems to be using the word as an ironical apostrophe to 'this day' which was to have been the firm centre of his bliss, and is now proving the period or end of his life" (138n5). On the contrary, Gaveston's use of the word "centre" parallels Edward's later, unironical use: there is no contradiction in saying that Gaveston's day is the centre or unmoving axis of his bliss, just as Edward's day is the centre of his misfortune. The centre remains fixed, and produces an effect of either bliss or misfortune depending upon the relational position of a given body in its tragic orbit. Gaveston may thus perhaps mean not that the day should have been but that it was the "centre" of his bliss. He did experience the bliss of day, having boasted that he was as high atop the world as "arctic people . . . / To whom the sun shines both by day and night" (I.i.15-16).

Gaveston's use of the word "period" further intensifies the metaphor of de casibus revolution. The word carries the etymological force of "circuit" or "revolution," and in its adjectival form refers to the revolution of heavenly bodies in their orbits. In fact, in the seventeenth century it crystallizes as a specialized astronomical term that denotes "the time in which a planet or satellite performs its revolution about its primary" (OED sb.2b). In Gaveston's lines, it signifies not simply the "end" but the "point of completion of [a] round of time or course of action" (OED sb.5): that is, the end of Gaveston's tragic revolution. Since Gaveston laments "this day" (unlike Edward, who rails against "day" generally), we may understand "day" as the time of sunlight or, more specifically, as the time it takes the earth to perform one revolution on its axis--that is, the period of twenty-four hours (OED sb.6). We may thus paraphrase Gaveston's lament: he asks if this twenty-four-hour period of sunlight must signal the completion of his orbit as a tragic character, and he then apostrophizes the day as the unmoving centre of his bliss, around which he has so completely revolved that he feels not bliss but a "hell of grief" (I.iv.116). As the above analysis has shown, Marlowe's use of the words "centre" and "period," along with the play's recurring references to "day" or to the sun, strongly imply an astronomical metaphor operating throughout the text. And yet, given the riddling quality of these two passages, the reader must exercise some ingenuity in assigning each speech precise significance in the context of the play. If we heed the lessons of poststructuralism, we will recognize that this process of signification reveals as much about the critic's own project as about the play itself.

The revolution of planetary bodies--even of the earth itself, whose inhabitants watch the sun daily rising and setting--is an unmistakable reminder of the forces of mutability, and hence serves as a fitting symbol for the temporal law of tragedy. Indeed, Renaissance literature supplies a conventional poetic equivalent for astronomy's postulate of the revolving body: the wheel of Fortune. The contemporary Elizabethan history play exploits the figure of Fortune and her wheel as a means of bringing order out of the chaos of historical materials: that is, as a means of narrativizing history into the shape of tragedy. Marlowe's fellow "University Wits" (the "generation of 1560," as Anthony Esler calls them) use a personified Fortune to make sprawling historical events cohere and to suggest the inscrutable causes of history. The fallen characters in George Peele's Edward I, for example, find that in the world of history "Unconstant Fortune still will have her course" (xxv). And in Thomas Lodge's The Wounds of Civil War (c. 1586-89), Marius the elder and Marius the younger in turn curse the "wretched stepdame of my fickle state" (II.ii.46) and "The wayward Lady of this wicked world, / That leads in luckless triumph wretched men" (II.iii.1-2). As critics have well documented, the goddess Fortuna and her wheel together figure as a prominent symbol of fate and mutability in medieval and Renaissance tragic narratives (Kiefer).

Fortune becomes an essential element in literary accounts of history such as Boccaccio's De casibus virorum illustrium and its English descendant the Mirror for Magistrates. The inherited classical model taught Renaissance writers that human history repeats itself. For this "cyclical model of history," Paul Budra notes, Fortune's wheel serves as a "natural metaphor" (309).[19] In the Mirror for Magistrates, which is concerned in all its accounts of tragic falls to show "the uncertainty of worldly fortune and the certainty of God's vengeance for sin" (Campbell, Tudor Conceptions 15), the recurring symbol of Fortune's wheel links together the long sequence of narratives into a series of typical cycles. The typical tragic cycle from bliss to misfortune that is described by all the narratives in the Mirror is often depicted as a ride on Fortune's wheel. For example, the story of "The Two Rogers"--a probable source for Marlowe's portrait of

Mortimer in Edward II--stresses Fortune's part in both tragedies. The younger Roger Mortimer begins his narration by claiming the exemplary status of his tale:

> Among the ryders of the rollyng wheele,
> That lost theyr holdes, Baldwin forget not me,
> Whose fatall threede false Fortune nedes would
> reele,
> Ere it were twysted by the systers three.
> All folke be frayle, theyr blysses brittle bee:
> For proofe whereof altho' none other wer,
> Suffyse may I, syr Roger Mortimer.
>
> (82)

The younger Mortimer goes on to narrate the story of his cousin Roger Mortimer, the historical character who colluded with Queen Isabella against Edward II (that is, the Mortimer who figures centrally in Marlowe's play). This Mortimer, too, learns Fortune's lesson: "He was condemned, and hanged at the last, / In whom dame Fortune fully shewed her kynde, / For whom she heaves, she hurleth downe as fast" (84). Both Mortimers rise and fall on the same wheel.

Marlowe uses the conventional symbol of Fortune's wheel from the Mirror for Magistrates to develop his portrait of Mortimer Junior. Mortimer reaches the acme of his power once Edward has been forced to renounce his crown. His instructions to Edward's jailers indicate that he has become like the _fortunatus_ Tamburlaine, boasting that he controls Fortune:

> As thou intendest to rise by Mortimer,
> Who now makes Fortune's wheel turn as he please,
> Seek all the means thou canst to make him droop,
> And neither give him kind word nor good look.
> (V.ii.52-55)

Since Mortimer has risen on the wheel, Edward has already begun to "droop," as we noted earlier. Marlowe depicts the Earl of March as a power-hungry Machiavellian leader who seeks to be "Fear'd . . . more than lov'd" (V.iv.52). In a burst of _hubris_, Mortimer pretends to absolute power over others and over time itself. He projects an alternate future for England:

> the queen and Mortimer
> Shall rule the realm, the king; and none rule us.
> Mine enemies will I plague, my friends advance;
> And what I list command who dare control?
> _Major sum quam cui possit fortuna nocere_.
> (V.iv.65-69)

Because he and his followers have distinguished themselves by their use of learned Latin throughout the play, Mortimer's tag from Ovid's _Metamorphoses_ is not surprising.[20] A literate Renaissance audience would recognize Mortimer's allusion as an invitation to Fortune to wreak her revenge. Mortimer echoes Niobe, who thought herself too great for fortune to harm; but Niobe's line is as charged with dramatic irony in the context of the Ovidian narrative as in the mouth of Marlowe's Mortimer. Indeed, Renaissance literature makes Niobe more proverbial for her tears, which she sheds endlessly after the overwhelming loss of her slain children, than for her hubristic defiance of Fortune.[21] Mortimer, of all the riders of Fortune's rolling wheel, should know that "whom she heaves, she hurleth down as fast."

Marlowe hurls down Mortimer with a great deal more alacrity than he did Tamburlaine. If Edward's opponent appears the Machiavellian villain, in comparison to Tamburlaine his politic machinations seem botched indeed. His _fortunatus_-like pride only flourishes in the last act of the play, and within two scenes of voicing it, he predictably becomes a victim of Fortune's capriciousness. The young Edward III takes his rightful place as king and sentences Mortimer to hanging, quartering, and beheading. At first, Mortimer's parting speech seems an entirely conventional echo of the _Mirror_ tradition:

> Base Fortune, now I see, that in thy wheel
> There is a point, to which when men aspire,
> They tumble headlong down: that point I touch'd,
> And, seeing there was no place to mount up
>   higher,
> Why should I grieve at my declining fall?

(V.vi.59-63)

Marlowe makes Mortimer defiantly unconventional, in fact. The earl's absolute refusal to evoke pity, to proclaim his own guilt, or to lament his fall clearly separates him from the pathetic, confessing ghost of his fallen cousin in the Mirror for Magistrates.

The attempt to control Fortune represents in Marlovian tragedy the attempt to control time, for Fortune's wheel functions as a symbolic analogue of the Thyestean day that watches the precipitous fall of the aspiring hero. Mortimer throughout the play, but especially in his headlong tumble, may remind us of Shakespeare's Hotspur, whose tragic end resulted from his inability to synchronize himself with time. Preparing for an impending clash with Prince Hal in 1 Henry IV, Hotspur shows his impatient desire to control time when he cries, "O, let the hours be short, / Till fields, and blows, and groans applaud our sport!" (I.iii.295-96).[22] Yet, like Mortimer, Hotspur learns in his dying speech that life is "time's fool, / And time, that takes survey of all the world, / Must have a stop" (V.iv.80-82).

Edward, too, shows the tragic struggle as a struggle against time. In a rare decisive moment as a potentially heroic leader, Marlowe's weak king even shows a glimmering of a fiery Hotspur spirit, for he too longs to abridge the hours and run ahead of time in order to clash in battle.

Edward's passion to avenge the death of his beloved Gaveston gives him a semblance of strength in two scenes (III.iii; IV.iii). But both scenes, sandwiched as they are between larger scenes involving his councillors and the enemy camp, so weaken Edward's potential for heroism that he seems the defiant Marlovian hero only if we take a given speech out of context. In the first scene, any apparent royal strength diminishes when we recognize the tight control maintained over court and king by Edward's councillors, especially Spencer Junior, who serves as a Gaveston-substitute (see III.ii.142-47). Edward, for example, not only swears vengeance after Spencer Junior advises, "My lord, refer your vengeance to the sword / Upon these barons" (III.ii.123-24), but also echoes Spencer's words later (III.iii.2-3). Though other advisers such as Baldock encourage him, "This haught resolve becomes your majesty" (III.ii.28), Edward's speech indicates his uncertainty and lack of resolve, as in the two helpless expressions "O shall I speak, or shall I sigh and die!" (III.ii.122) and "If I be England's king" (135). The reader's impression that Edward is not so much master of England as victim of his councillors and of his own passionate inclinations increases even after the capture of Mortimer and the rebel barons, at which time Edward proclaims that his triumph warrants a second coronation (III.iii.75-76). As the scene ends, Spencer Junior and the other councillors remain on stage to determine the real business of the country, the plan concerning Isabella.

Thus in the second scene, when Edward voices a desire to control time, his speech is charged with the irony of his weakened situation. He has just learned that the escaped Mortimer and Queen Isabella have joined forces. His ironic aubade suggests that Edward II presents the underside, as it were, of Marlowe's notion elsewhere that heroism is the ability to hold back the horses of the night:

> Gallop apace, bright Phoebus, through the sky,
> And dusky night, in rusty iron car,
> Between you both shorten the time, I pray,
> That I may see that most desired day,
> When we may meet these traitors in the field.
> (IV.iii.45-49)

Edward's wish to "shorten the time," anticipating Hotspur's more heroic impatience, shows the king in a rare imperative mood, eager to turn Fortune's wheel himself. Yet Edward seems a type of Phaeton, and his command that Phoebus and Night together cooperate to quicken the journey of the sun's "car" through the sky ironically underscores his own mismanagement of the sun's galloping horses.

In keeping with Marlowe's Phaeton-allusions, Edward succeeds only in creating a disordered night. And indeed, even Shakespeare's Juliet (whose epithalamion, beginning

"Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds," echoes Edward's words) recalls that "such a waggoner / As Phaeton" would "bring in cloudy night immediately" (III.ii.1-5). Juliet, and Marlowe's own transcendent lovers, can invoke "love-performing night" because in their worlds love "best agrees with night" (*Rom*. III.ii.10).[23] But in Edward's world, where love has been murdered, what presides is not "civil night" (*Rom*. III.ii.10), ally of lovers, but rather "seeling night" (*Mac*. III.ii.46), enemy of order and communion. The invocation of night in *Edward II* brings forth only increased "civil broils" (IV.iv.6): Kent directs his prayer, "Stand gracious, gloomy night / To his device" (IV.i.10-11), towards Mortimer, not Edward. The hellish night-space of this play-world results from Edward's inability to control the throne. "Misgoverned kings are cause of all this wrack" (IV.iv.9), as Isabella points out. Shakespeare's words concerning another misgoverned king apply equally well to Edward: this "Phaeton hath tumbled from his car, / And made an evening at the noontide prick" (*3H6* I.iv.33-34).

Edward never sees his "most desired day" but remains a helpless rider of the rolling wheel. Although he mocks the distant strength of Isabella and Mortimer, saying "Welcome, a God's name, madam, and your son; / England shall welcome you and all your rout" (IV.iii.43-44), the following speech of the play answers Edward's "dry mock" (to use Puttenham's term) by piling on more irony.[24] Marlowe creates both a structural and rhetorical irony, as the rebel camp clearly prepares for victory over Edward, and Isabella cries, "Welcome to England all, with prosperous winds" (IV.iv.2). The next time we see Edward he is fleeing from Mortimer's troops. In response to Edward's call for a horse, and his wish to die a heroic death in a "bed of honours . . . with fame" (IV.v.7), even Baldock, who had earlier encouraged him to seek revenge, cries, "this princely resolution / Fits not the time" (IV.v.8-9).

Edward cannot make time and desire agree. The "gloomy night" of the play inclines towards the "device" of Mortimer. But Mortimer falls, too, without having enjoyed the fruits of power. An early scene of the play foretells the doom of human devices. When Edward (more ironically than he knows) asks Mortimer, "what's thy device / Against the stately triumph we decreed?" (II.ii.11-12), Mortimer and Lancaster explain the emblematic designs they plan to bear on their shields at the upcoming royal tournament. Mortimer's device, in which a canker creeps to the highest bough of a "lofty cedar-tree," bears "The motto, _Aeque tandem_" (II.ii.16-20). Lancaster's shield emblematizes a flying fish that, mounting in the air, is seized by a fowl --"The motto this: _Undique mors est_" (II.ii.23-28). Both mottoes encapsulate the central theme of the play. The canker (Gaveston) is at length one with the cedar-tree

(Edward), but only because both fall equally in misfortune. And if it oppresses on all sides, death encircles all Marlowe's characters, trapping them to endure endless revolution.

Marlowe uses ironic natural imagery to show death surrounding his play-world in Edward II. Mortimer's and Lancaster's devices exemplify what Geoffrey Whitney, the popular emblem-writer, specifies as the emblem drawn from nature. The nature revealed in the devices of Edward II, however, is the harsh, predatory, devouring world of time. Mortimer's subsequent comment on his ancestral ensign ironically associates him, despite his climbing, with a natural world that is dead. Mortimer's pride in his ancestral name testifies as well to the ubiquity of death, even though at first it seems to offer strong resistance against Edward. As if to gain confidence from a primal brush with death, Mortimer advances on Edward with what he calls "This tottered ensign of my ancestors, / Which swept the desert shore of that dead sea / Whereof we got the name of Mortimer" (II.iii.21-23). Yet the dead, symbolically unmoving sea eventually engulfs Mortimer as it does those he opposes; as Gaveston recognizes before his murder, "heading is one, and hanging is the other, / And death is all" (II.v.29-31). Once the king's Phaeton-like downfall makes the heavenly sphere seem "Rent" and the orb of the sun seem to lose its fire (IV.vi.101), Baldock acts as the genius of the play.[25] He contracts or "reduce[s]" all its "lessons" to this: "all live to die, and rise to fall" (IV.vi.109, 111).

iv.

The deadening of the heroic impulse in Edward II, the evident futility of the attempt to control time (as symbolized by the sun, or by Fortune's wheel), and the focus on repeating cycles of destruction suggest the play's rightful classification as a tragedy, not a history play. Rather than the broad providential sweep of history characteristic of the history play, Marlowe develops a recurring tragic cycle of rise-and-fall.[26] Edward III, who brings a tenuous kind of resolution in the final scene, seems less a full-bodied order figure capable of restoring the realm than a *rex ex machina*, to use Ricardo Quinones' phrase (300). His strength appears only in the final scene of the play, where he speaks a scant forty-one lines as empowered king. Marlowe also studiously omits any references to the contemporary throne, references which constitute a conventional feature of other Elizabethan history plays. Marlowe's retelling of his story focusses not on the re-membering of England through a relevant, immediate past but on the dismembering of the king and of the body politic.

Hero and Leander and, to a lesser extent, Tamburlaine delay death and submission, the end of tragedy, to such an extent that these works constitute Marlowe's *tours de force* of dilation. Conversely, *Edward II* compresses dalliance, the beginning of tragedy, so much that the play (read in the context of Marlowe's entire corpus) should be seen as a *tour de force* of contraction. In transforming history into tragedy, Marlowe deals his historical sources as insolent a blow as he did when transforming orthodox tragedy into a kind of heroic romance. In utter defiance of historical time, he has Mortimer's head, which fell in 1330, placed on Edward's hearse of 1327. Marlowe thus matches Edward's doomed desire to "shorten the time" with his own daring compression of historical events.

The title-page of the 1594 octavo edition of *Edward II* hints at this very compression, for it promises to deliver an account of "The troublesome raigne and lamentable death of Edward *the second*, *King of* England: with the tragicall *fall of proud* Mortimer." In order to weave together these two plots, Marlowe masterfully skips over the times and dates of his main source.[27] According to Holinshed, the entire events of Edward II's reign, combined with Mortimer's downfall in the reign of Edward III, embrace a period of twenty-three years, from 1307 to 1330. But this period, given Marlowe's considerable reshuffling of dates, seems reducible to far less. Charlton and Waller argue, "According to a strict analysis the action could be compassed within a year, in which Edward lost wife, crown, and life" (35). Buland more painstakingly shows that Marlowe compresses the action of the play even further, into "four or five months" (85; 276-81). And, as we have seen, Marlowe's imagery suggests a greater compression still. Marlowe not only unifies the decades encompassing the two falls of Edward and Mortimer into a single tragic sequence of beginning, middle, and end; he also develops a recurring set of images that suggest the protagonists have experienced a "sunshine day" that has ceded to night. By imposing over the historical events of his play this classically derived notion of tragedy as a revolution from dawn to dusk, Marlowe contracts the twenty-three years of Edward's declining reign, like the twenty-four years of Faustus's dalliance, into a single Thyestean day.[28]

By representing time as a metaphorical day in Edward II and Dr. Faustus, Marlowe both acknowledges and defies classical notions that a dramatist must adhere to the unity of time. The established conventions of Elizabethan theatre certainly did not dictate that Marlowe follow the classical unity of time, or the closely related unity of place. Contemporary writers were notorious for their unclassical depiction of dramatic action spanning years and continents. Sidney, upholding classical precedent in his Defence of Poetry, argues that in a play "the uttermost time presupposed . . . should be, both by Aristotle's precept and common reason, but one day" (65), and he censures more severely other contemporary plays for their over-liberal convention of depicting entire lifetimes on the stage.[29] However, if he follows contemporary practice in breaking the unity of time, Marlowe also skillfully provides structural unity for his plays, in the form of such dramatic references to time as Faustus's re-cycled midnight hour or Edward's and Gaveston's "day" of revolving bliss and misfortune.

In Edward II, Marlowe's technique of contracting historical time gives the action an appearance of swift movement, despite the time-intervals implied between scenes when characters must shift locales. For example, Gaveston's banishment and reinstatement in Edward's court, which take place without specific references to time elapsed, seem closely continuous actions in the opening act of the play. In the absence of a chorus or other device to indicate time's passing, even the shifting of Mortimer across the ocean to France and back seems immediate (IV.i-IV.iii).

Marlowe's handling of time in Edward II reveals a contradiction familiar in Renaissance plays: the close, seemingly continuous arrangement of scenes coexists with subtle suggestions of the long time-intervals required. Marlowe makes use of a "double time" scheme, giving the action a simultaneous impression of swiftness (or contraction) and slowness (or dilation). Though the play's action might take place in several months, Marlowe also implies that years have passed (Buland 280-81). On two occasions, the text indicates Edward's aging, in order to intensify the pathos of his fall. In an early scene, Mortimer Senior advises his nephew to let the king "without controulment have his will," since Edward's "youth is flexible, / And promiseth as much as we can wish" (I.iv.389, 397-98). The elder Mortimer feels certain that Edward will renounce Gaveston when "riper years will wean him from such toys" (400). In the final act of the play, having been forcibly divorced from the "toys" of his youth, Edward has become "aged Edward" (V.ii.12), or (in his own designation) "old Edward" (V.iii.23).

Like Shakespeare, Marlowe uses temporal inconsistencies to heighten tragic effect--that is, to indicate the psychological effects of the action on his characters. While he twice laments that he has stood mired and sleepless in his dungeon for "ten days" (V.v.59-93), Edward's dying scene stresses his psychological experience of time as a stagnant pool rather than a flowing river. The sign of time's oppression is the continual torture that Edward endures in the dungeon. While Mortimer commands that Edward move from a dungeon in Killingworth (or Kenilworth) Castle to one in Berkeley Castle (V.ii.60-61), the text emphasizes the appropriately named "Killingworth Castle" (V.ii.19; V.iii.48; V.iv.84) and presents both dungeons, typologically, as one and the same. Edward himself moans, "all places are alike, / And every earth is fit for burial" (V.i.145-46). In V.iii, "Within a dungeon England's king is kept" (19); his "daily diet is heart-breaking sobs" (21), "all [his] senses are annoy'd with stench" (18), and he is washed with "channel water" (27). Two scenes later, his suffering suggests no change in situation, as Matrevis's description testifies:

> I wonder the king dies not,
> Being in a vault up to the knees in water,
> To which the channels of the castle run,
> From whence a damp continually ariseth,
> That were enough to poison any man,
> Much more a king brought up so tenderly.
> (V.v.1-6)

The stench of this dungeon, too, is so bad that the captors themselves are "almost stifled with the savour" (9). The "heart-breaking sobs" that kept time in the earlier scene here change to the incessant beat of a drum (60). In his "hell of grief" (88), Edward has not slept for "ten days" (93) and is quite literally "overwatch'd" (91). His imprisonment anticipates that of Shakespeare's Richard II, who articulates his own victimization as time's "numb'ring clock" (V.v.50).[30] In Edward's world, as in Richard II's, "time is broke and no proportion kept" (R2 V.v.43); formerly time-wasters, both weak kings are wasted--"overwatched"--by time.

Marlowe telescopes Holinshed's historical account in various ways: not just in the depiction of Edward's final dungeon scenes or in the merging of Mortimer's and Edward's falls, but also in the linking of Edward's fixation with the Spencers to his love for Gaveston. Historically, Spencer Junior, whom Marlowe has Gaveston recommend to the king (II.ii.47-49), did not enjoy full royal favour until 1322, a decade after Gaveston's death. But even as Gaveston is drawn to his death, Marlowe shows Edward adopting Spencer as a substitute favourite (III.ii.176-79). And Edward connects both favourites in his torture and humiliation: "O Gaveston, it is for thee that I am wrong'd, / For me, both thou and both the Spencers died!" (V.iii.41-42). Moreover, in another compression of Holinshed's time-scheme, Marlowe has Kent beheaded while Edward is yet in prison (V.iv), whereas the historical Kent was executed in 1330, three years after Edward's own murder. Marlowe's planting of Mortimer's head on Edward's hearse thus exemplifies his treatment of historical time throughout the play. Marlowe piles the falling bodies so high on top each other that Edward II finally seems an exaggerated distortion of de casibus tragedy. But even Sidney gives approval for Marlowe's poetic intention, if not for his execution: in the Defence he points out that "a tragedy is tied to the laws of poesy, and not of history; not bound to follow the story, but having liberty either to feign a quite new matter or to frame the history to the most tragical conveniency" (66). The "tragical conveniency" provided by Marlowe's temporal frame shows him (in another "insolent coup," though far different from his artistic coup in Tamburlaine) thumbing his nose at history.

Marlowe's major, unconventional departure from Holinshed--and his chief transformation of de casibus tragedy--comes at the end of the play, when he refuses to moralize Edward's history. In all the sources, including Holinshed, Edward repents his wasteful youth and ill choice of councillors (Charlton and Waller 37n1). But Marlowe's Edward, as Deats argues, proves a poor "pupil in adversity's schoolroom" ("Marlowe's Fearful Symmetry" 252). Marlowe himself, in fact, refuses to admit that adversity teaches anything but the predatory cruelty of human nature. Holinshed's Edward points to his own wickedness: "he knew that he was fallen into this miserie through his owne offenses, and therefore he was contented patientlie to suffer it" (585). Marlowe's Edward, on the other hand, insists on his own "guiltless life" (V.i.73) and "innocent hands" (98) and points instead to the "treacheries" (V.i.89) and "[i]nhuman" cruelty (V.i.72) of others. Awareness of his own sin eludes him: "Yet how have I transgress'd, / Unless it be with too much clemency?" (V.i.122-23). Edward's fall results from "hell and cruel Mortimer; / The gentle heavens have not to do in this" (IV.vi.74-75). Marlowe's decision to make the falls of Edward and Mortimer coincide, and his devolution of the action on Edward III, further serve to justify Edward's own right to vengeance. Even the dissimulating widow Isabella, whom the younger Edward comforts in Holinshed (599), is condemned and almost entirely divested of sympathetic touches. Marlowe's Edward II thus becomes not the conventional tragic lesson in weak kingship but rather a disturbing rewriting of history.[31]

Even Lightborn, Marlowe's wholly invented character whose name (the English equivalent of "Lucifer") derives from a devil in the Chester mystery cycle (Harry Levin 101), serves to emphasize Edward's martyred state and to intensify Marlowe's ironic portrait of history. In the final scenes of the play, Marlowe paints the landscape of hell. As early as Act IV, Edward suggests that he has fallen as far as possible, and that the remainder of the play will hence only prolong his torturous condition:

> lay me in a hearse,
> And to the gates of hell convey me hence;
> Let Pluto's bells ring out my fatal knell,
> And hags howl for my death at Charon's shore....
> (IV.vi.86-89)

A few short lines after the apostrophe to "day, / Centre of all misfortune" (61-62), the text implies that Edward has been "benighted" (85). His position knee-deep in filthy, stinking channel water recalls the position of Tantalus, but in Marlowe's ironic transformation even the object of desire has been removed: Tantalus at least can reach towards the clear water or overhanging fruit, but Edward remains utterly bereft, and Marlowe leaves him that way for another full act.

v.

If he shortens or compresses the historical time of events in Edward's reign, Marlowe also dilates the torture of Edward, thereby tantalizing the reader with the prospect of his death. Tamburlaine postpones the god-like hero's death by dilating the fulfillment of desire, at least through conquest; Edward II postpones the ironic hero's death by dilating the failure of desire, through torture. Marlowe's contemporary audience may well have known the chronicle accounts of Edward's end, including the horrible method used to accomplish the murder. Exploiting Holinshed's hints that Edward possessed "stoutnesse of stomach" and a "tough nature" (588; see Charlton and Waller 37), Marlowe shows the king's captors testing and destroying that toughness, from the time when Edward's death becomes imminent (IV.vi).

Marlowe actively involves the reader in Edward's torture by cramming the final act with metafictional references to Edward's desire for, and evasion of, death. Even the pastoral retreat of the monastery, whose "life contemplative is heaven" (IV.vi.20), offers Edward no security. He longs to die--"never open these eyes again, / Never again lift up this drooping head, / O never more lift up this dying heart!" (IV.vi.41-43). In the following scene, Edward again pathetically hopes for death: "I know the next news that they bring / Will be my death; and welcome shall it be; / To wretched men death is felicity" (V.i.125-27); but his prophecy, like his other utterances in the play, ironically miscarries. Through the use of the sympathetic jailers Leicester and Berkeley, mentioned in Holinshed's account (qtd. in Charlton and Waller 182n127; cf. Edward II V.ii.34-35), Marlowe postpones the death that Edward craves and makes Edward's "next news" only a command that Leicester resign his post as jailer to Berkeley. And, despite hints of the jailers' pity for Edward, Marlowe virtually ignores Holinshed's suggestions that Edward enjoys "a kind of honorable estate, although he was prisoner" (584). Edward may be in physical "health" while captive, but he is full of "pensiveness" (V.ii.25). His "thoughts are martryred with endless torments" that offer no comfort (V.i.80-81).

The elusive "felicity" of death, the bliss he seeks, becomes the very subject of Edward's speeches. Mortimer's persistent torture prompts Edward to ask, "When will the fury of his mind assuage? / When will his heart be satisfied with blood?" (V.iii.8-9). The abundance of these questions in the text impels the reader to ask them, too, and to wonder, as Edward does, at the power of his own vital spark: "can my air of life continue long / When all my senses are annoy'd with stench?" (V.iii.16-17). Two scenes later, even Edward's captors "wonder the king dies not" (V.v.1). Throughout Act V, then, Marlowe thwarts Edward's pervertedly hopeful conviction "That death ends all, and I can die but once" (V.i.153). To remain in history, bound temporally and spatially to torture, constitutes a worse fate than death itself.

The reader's involvement in the dilation of Edward's death intensifies in the scene of his murder, which suggests the complicity of the onlookers. And indeed, critics who allege that Edward's horrifying inward mutilation by a "red-hot" spit (V.v.30) is an instance of _lex talionis_, the inexorable moral law of tragedy, prove their own complicity in the crime.[32] But even in Edward's final minutes, Marlowe attempts to dilate his protagonist's death, this time by having Edward himself call for delay. Edward recognizes Lightborn's murderous intent: "These looks of thine can harbour nought but death: / I see my tragedy written in thy brows" (V.v.72-74). Yet the text shows Edward's desire for what we might call a stay of execution, through the repetition of the characteristically Marlovian word "stay" (73,98,100). Even his last line--"O spare me, or despatch me in a trice" (V.v.110)--reveals Edward's helpless conflict with time, and underscores his inability to dilate time.

Edward's torturous death begins as a "gloomy fellow in a mead" betrays him (IV.vi.29). Marlowe's unhistorical, invented character of the Mower gains great iconographical power in the context of the tragedy. As the Mower violates the sanctuary of Edward's protective monastery, like a type of Death invading Arcadia, the stage direction indicates, "Enter, with Welsh hooks." The use of sickle-like billhooks, used ostensibly to "mow" the grass of the "mead," clearly evokes, in a Renaissance context, the iconographical associations of Father Time. Erwin Panofsky has outlined the "pseudomorphosis" or transformation of the classical figure of Time in the Renaissance: by confusing the Greek word for Time (Chronos) with the name of the oldest god (Kronos, the Roman god Saturn), who as the patron of agriculture often carried a sickle, the Renaissance came to associate Time with symbols of decay and destruction (73). Since Saturn was also associated with Death, the Renaissance represented Death iconographically as equipped with a sickle; and "Time, having appropriated the qualities of the deadly, cannibalistic, scythe-branishing Saturn, became more and more intimately related to Death" (Panofsky 82, 77). In Edward II, Marlowe gives the flat but iconographically rich character of the Mower, this Saturnine fellow of "gloomy temperament," only two lines; one involves a symbolically suggestive exchange with the treacherous baron Rice ap Howell:

> Mow. Your worship, I trust, will remember me?
> Rice. Remember thee, fellow! what else?
> (IV.vi.115-116)

Although he scarcely needs a *memento mori* in this play (since *Undique mors est*), Marlowe's use of a lowly agricultural worker to betray Edward is a nice touch in the context of the play's recurring imagery of natural cycles of decay and destruction.

Edward II as an aborted tragedy of pleasure answers the will for what Marlowe would call "dalliance" with the voice of experience: time and death destroy the pastoral vision. Yet the opening soliloquy, with its comparison of Gaveston to "Leander" (I.i.8) and its brief taste of words that make one "surfeit with delight" (I.i.3), combined with the continuing love of Edward for Gaveston throughout the play, suggests that the pastoral dream remains an agonizing need in this play. Marlowe, like Shakespeare, dreams of a world where "Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks / Within his bending sickle's compass come" (Sonnet

116). Indeed, the play's opening words supply an invitation to love, as Gaveston reads Edward's lines, "'Come . . . / And share the kingdom with thy dearest friend'" (I.i.1-2). We recognize in the invitation an echo of Marlowe's pastoral poem "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love": "Come live with me, and be my love, / And we will all the pleasures prove" (1-2). Time and Death, however, give the same answer to Edward as Sir Walter Ralegh gave to Marlowe's celebrated poem:

> But Time drives flocks from field to fold,
> When rivers rage and rocks grow cold,
> And Philomel becometh dumb;
> The rest complains of cares to come.
>
> The flowers do fade, and wanton fields
> To wayward winter reckoning yields;
> A honey tongue, a heart of gall
> Is fancy's spring, but sorrow's fall.
>
> ("The Nymph's Reply" 5-12)

In Edward II, the "honey tongue" of Marlowe's dilated tragedies becomes a "heart of gall" that is felt throughout most the play. Marlowe mows down "wanton fields" in this most ironic tragedy, involving us in a chilling amoral vision of history where time becomes Macbeth's demonic experience of "one clock-tick after another" (Frye, "Rhythms of Time" 158).

Marlowe, like Shakespeare (as Quinones describes his technique, particularly in the histories), "utilizes 'psychological time,' in which the final short period before the climactic event is drawn out" (298). The pleasure of Marlovian tragedy lies in this drawing out or deferral of the end. The mythical paradigm for the dilatory impulse in Marlowe's more romantic tragedies (Tamburlaine and Dido), as in Hero and Leander, is Jupiter's triumph over time in holding back dawn's horses. But in Edward II, Marlowe protracts a night of pain rather than pleasure, where the "benighted" hero's moans cannot make the sun "Continue." The ultimate irony of Edward's Gehenna-dungeon or "unharrowed hell" is that the weak king, like Faustus, "cannot make [his] sun / Stand still," but rather brings about his own downfall when he tries to "make him run" (Marvell, "To His Coy Mistress" 45-46). The temporal law of tragedy writes Edward's final period, as it does for all Marlowe's protagonists, bringing about the tragic revolution of Fortune's wheel and pulling down the would-be hero in the very act of leaping upwards. And yet the play does offer a triumph over time, as Marlowe ends by brazenly exhibiting the head of Mortimer Junior on Edward's hearse and fitting historical matter to his own "tragical conveniency." In his still-living text, which re-members itself even as we dissect it, Marlowe not only whips the sun forward in its course but also shows it standing still.

Notes

[1] Many critics have commented on the play's tightly controlled de casibus structure: see Fricker; Waith, "Edward II"; and Deats, "Marlowe's Fearful Symmetry." As Deats demonstrates, Edward II exhibits a "symmetry of antithetical or parallel sequences [that] correlates with a simultaneous movement of alternating rises and falls, whereby Edward's ascent and descent are augmented by a series of additional de casibus exempla" (243). Farnham briefly places Edward II in the context of Elizabethan de casibus tragedy (408).

[2] All quotations from Edward II are taken from Charlton and Waller's edition, with its excellent summaries of Marlowe's historical sources.

[3] For a lucid explication of Derridean differance, see Culler, On Deconstruction 97. Culler quotes Derrida's definition of the term in Positions as a "structure and a movement that cannot be conceived on the basis of the opposition presence/absence. Differance is the systematic play of differences, of traces of differences, of the spacing [espacement] by which elements relate to one another" (97). My use of the term need not, of course, undermine the ultimate merit of a generic study of Marlowe's tragic structures: significantly, Marlowe's works (especially The Jew of Malta) demand that we

recognize both the social construction of (binary) categories and the blurring of those categories through tragedy. See also Derrida's "Law of Genre," and my final chapter.

[4] Using the term "tragedy" to denote both a narrative structure, or "pre-generic mythos," and a specific form of drama, Northrop Frye has persuasively outlined the possible gradations of tragedy from "high romance to bitter and ironic realism" (Anatomy 162). Frye thus classifies tragic works according to their placement on a continuum from the heroic to the ironic.

[5] See also McCloskey, who shows that limitation and constraint describe the ways in which the play's characters become entrapped in roles.

[6] In his article and his later book, Quinones outlines three different views of time in Shakespeare: augmentative time, which allows for judgment of actions and characters (used in the sonnets and history plays); contracted time, which gives a psychological sense of life's brevity (used in the love romances); and extended time, which brings with it the concept of eternity (used in the late romances). See also Montgomery, who builds upon Quinones' argument.

[7] Quinones sets Marlowe's two speeches together but treats them only in passing (321-22).

[8] On Shakespeare's representation of time in the history plays (especially in the Lancastrian tetralogy), see Hart, "Temporality"; and Kastan, "Shape" and Shakespeare. See also Jorgensen's article on the concept of "redeeming time" in 1 Henry IV; and Montgomery's discussion of the "dimensions of time" in Richard II.

[9] Discussions of Marlowe's Edward as a precursor of Shakespeare's Richard are common fare. One of the most recent valuable articles on the subject compares the "visual vocabularies" of the two tragic heroes, concluding that Marlowe, by employing ironic effects in stage tableaux, gestures, and ceremonial props, shows that he exploits the "brutal circumstances of juxtaposition" more than Shakespeare (Bevington and Shapiro 276).

[10] Mahood was among the first to argue that Faustus reveals the "disintegration of humanism." Along the same lines, see Fitz.

[11] Quoted in Buland 8. In her first chapter, Buland points to John Wilson and Nicholas Halpin as the earliest critics to recognize Shakespeare's use of "double time." According to Wilson, Shakespeare uses "two clocks" in Macbeth and Othello, whereby "We have the effect of both--distinct knowledge of neither. We have suggestions to our Understanding of extended time--we have movements of our Will by precipitated time. . . ." (qtd. in Buland 8). Buland's study advances our understanding of this dramatic

technique by showing the "many instances of the phenomenon of double time in plays written before Shakespeare began his work" (9).

[12] In the section on "ornament," or figurative language, Puttenham lists "Cronographia, or the Counterfait time" as the figure of speech used when literary artists "describe the time or season of the yeare, as winter, summer, haruest, day, midnight, noone, euening, or such like" (239).

[13] As Peter Ure points out, Holinshed reports that Edward IV first adopted the sun as a badge, and that it was Richard II's personal badge. See Ure's Arden edition of Richard II 115n178; cf. Holinshed 660/1/22.

[14] See Quinones' brief treatment of the Phaeton myth as a "metaphor of ineffectual horsemanship" or mismanagement of time. As Maclean shows Phaeton's association with time, Quinones points out that "time and the halter have been traditionally associated in art" and imply the "control associated with a fatherly adult world" (321).

[15] It has been suggested that Edward II gained its characteristic quality, so different from that of Tamburlaine, Dr. Faustus, or even The Jew of Malta, because it was written for a repertory company whose strength lay not in a great and thundering star like Alleyn but in a tight-knit cast who could manage the speeches more evenly (Harry Levin 86-87; cf. Tucker Brooke, Life of

Marlowe 99).

[16] Cunningham suggests the possibility that Marlowe in *Edward II* changed his usual practice of supplying the play with a self-conscious prologue; instead he may have "omitted the prologue and melded its function and attitudes into Gaveston" (225n3).

[17] Gaveston's self-styled comparison with "Caesar riding in the Roman street, / With captive kings at his triumphant car" (I.i.173-4) echoes a passage from Lucan's *Pharsalia*, which was of course well-known to Marlowe, who translated Lucan (see Godshalk, "Marlowe and Lucan"). That Marlowe inserts other passages from Lucan in the play (I.i.173; I.iv.102-3; IV.v.60) is not surprising, given that Marlowe's historical tragedy, like Lucan's *Pharsalia*, deals with the dangers of civil war.

[18] On the transcendence of the king's "corporate personality" or perpetual body, as opposed to his natural body, see the classical study by Kantorowicz. More recently, Hart discusses the complexities of the "Body Divided" in Shakespeare's Lancastrian tetralogy.

[19] Budra argues that the cyclical model of history, embodied in the figure of Fortune, "has no place in a divinely ordered, providential universe" and works at cross-purposes with the avowedly Christian purpose of the *Mirror for Magistrates* (309). Budra persuasively shows that the Christian model of history insists on divine

intervention rather than depicting a world given over to Fortune's irrational, arbitrary guidance. But it is unclear why Budra finds the Greco-Roman tradition the only one that promotes the cyclical model of the Mirror, wherein "all events are perceived as archetypal" (304). Biblical typology, the hermeneutic system by which Christians read history according to recognizable types or patterns revealed in Scripture, would also presumably have underscored the view of history as a series of repeating cycles or paradigms (though, of course, human history ultimately reaches an end in Christ). For a clear example of this cyclical view (used by perhaps the most celebrated of avowedly Christian writers), see Milton's view of human history in Paradise Lost XI-XII. Despite their various manifestations, the narratives by which Adam gains his history-lesson can be subsumed under two opposing structural paradigms, which we may call the salvation-plot and the damnation-plot.

[20] From the beginning of the play, Marlowe adds to Holinshed by connecting the earls' and barons' use of Latin with their class status. Mortimer and his camp wear their knowledge of Ovid's Metamorphoses like a badge of superiority. Like his son, Mortimer Senior quotes Ovid's Metamorphoses when he wants to stress his class superiority over Gaveston: "What man of noble birth can brook this sight? / Quam male conveniunt! / See what a

scornful look the peasant casts" (I.iv.12-14). Marlowe invites the reader to expand this clipped and slightly modified citation from Metamorphoses ii.846, and realize how poorly majesty and love fit together. Warwick also recalls the Metamorphoses, i.755 ff., when he compares the "Ignoble vassal" Gaveston to "Phaeton" (I.iv.16). Mortimer Junior's line from the Metamorphoses is preceded by his complaint that Gaveston is a "peasant" and a "lown"--"hardly . . . a gentleman by birth" (I.iv.218, 82, 29).

[21] The following pair of examples (from plays thought to be heavily influenced by Marlowe) illustrate the Renaissance use of Niobe as a type of tragic female mourner. In Peele's Edward I, Glocester speaks the final words of the play over Joan's dead body: "All pomp in time must fall, and grow to nothing. / Wept I like Niobe, yet it profits nothing" (xxv). Shakespeare's Hamlet puzzles over his mother's brief mourning period, during which she seemed "Like Niobe, all tears" (I.ii.149).

[22] Shakespeare may in fact have used Marlowe's Mortimer Junior as a model for Hotspur. A.R. Humphreys notes that when Hotspur vows to ransom Mortimer, he echoes Mortimer in Edward II. Shakespeare modifies Marlowe's lines--"Cousin, and if he will not ransom him, / I'll thunder such a peal into his ears / As never subject did unto his king" (II.ii.125-27)--into Hotspur's cry, "And in his ear I'll holla 'Mortimer'!" (I.iii.220) . See the Arden edition of

1 Henry IV (32n220).

[23] Brian Gibbons outlines a few of the parallels between Marlowe's Hero and Leander and Juliet's epithalamion. See his notes to Romeo and Juliet (III.ii.1-19) in the Arden edition.

[24] Puttenham's definition is as follows: "Ye doe . . . dissemble, when ye speake in derision or mockerie, & that may be many waies: as sometime in sport, sometime in earnest, and priuily, and apertly, and pleasantly, and bitterly: but . . . by the figure Ironia, which we call the drye mock" (189).

[25] Richard Hardin treats Baldock as "the center of a minor drama that unfolds, a sort of 'scholar's progress'" (391): Baldock, like Faustus, indicates Marlowe's own apparent conflict between "the world and the book" (390).

[26] See Tillyard's argument that Edward II creates no sense of the providential sweep or pattern of history; and Ribner's response, "Marlowe's Edward II" (164). For a more recent contextual study of the role of Providence in Shakespeare, see Kelly.

[27] See Charlton and Waller: "Edward II is based almost entirely on Holinshed's Chronicles of England either in the first or second edition (1577 or 1587). Consequently it is with Holinshed's account of the reign that we must chiefly concern ourselves . . ." (31). The editors provide an extremely valuable "time analysis" of the entire play, in

which they show Marlowe's compression of history by following the play's events scene by scene, and giving Holinshed's corresponding dates throughout (33-35).

[28] Buland contends that Seneca's notion of the unity of time exerted almost no influence on Elizabethan dramatists: "They might borrow his horrible situations, his ghosts, his soliloquies, or his rhetoric, but they made no attempt to force the tragic action into the compass of one day" (32). But, as we have seen, Marlowe does attempt, through imagery and indeed through the couplet from Seneca's Thyestes, to extend metaphorically the unity of a twenty-four-hour day into a symbolic day of tragic rise-and-fall. The popularity of this Thyestean couplet in Renaissance drama up to Jonson (Charlton and Waller 172n53) suggests that other contemporary playwrights carefully depict a figurative, if not a literal, day in which the tragic action takes place.

[29] Sidney complains about how "ordinary it is that two young princes fall in love; after many traverses, she is got with child, delivered of a fair boy; he is lost, groweth a man, falls in love, and is ready to get another child; and all this in two hours' space. . . ." (66). I am indebted to Buland for her discussion of these passages (37) and of Jonson's similarly censorious Prologue to Every Man in His Humor (43-48). Jonson's Prologue ridicules the "ill custom of the age," which uses choruses to waft the

audience overseas or represents lifetimes in the stage period of two hours: we recall the Chorus of Dr. Faustus, whose wafting of the Renaissance audience overseas brings a corresponding indication of much time passed; and the great time-spans of 2 Tamburlaine, where sons are conceived, born, and brought to maturity in two hours' space. Buland also notes a similar censure of the contemporary treatment of time in Cervantes' Don Quixote (Bk. IV, chap. 48; qtd. in Buland 44).

[30] Richard's last soliloquy, which heavily thematizes time, recalls Marlowe's portrait of Edward. Like Edward's daily diet of "heart-breaking sobs," Richard's "thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar / Their watches on unto mine eyes" (V.v.51-52).

[31] That Renaissance writers recognized the subjectivity of history is suggested by plays such as Bale's King John (1561), which follows Tyndale in re-writing the Protestant king's career from a favourable angle. Bale explicitly censures the previous (Catholic) chroniclers: "You priests are the cause that chronicles doth defame / So many princes and men of notable name; / For you take upon you to write them evermore . . . ." (20). Armstrong outlines the origins of the history play in the Protestant urge to reform the works of Catholic chroniclers (vii).

[32] Guy-Bray and Summers both argue that what makes critics most complicit in the scapegoating of Edward is a "neurotic condition known as homophobia, the fear and loathing of homosexuality" (Summers 221). Summers singles out Sanders as particularly dis-eased with this condition; Guy-Bray offers a more thorough summary of the critical stances towards Edward's homosexuality. Both critics insist that Marlowe refuses to moralize on Edward's "sexual preference."

ACT V

"To Save the Ruin of a Multitude": The Jew of Malta and The Massacre at Paris

Marlowe dares his reader to dally in the pleasure of the text. While they obey the law of tragedy that cuts short the protagonist's rebellion, and evoke a conventional *de casibus* ending that satisfies the orthodox, Marlowe's plays also self-consciously underscore the dilation of the tragic end. Yet the *de casibus*-like retribution concluding Marlowe's plays does more than spell the end of dalliance for the reader and the protagonist. As critics who insist on Marlowe's conventional morality show, the retributive ending can be made to serve a moral purpose, to point up the sinfulness of the suffering protagonist, "Whose fiendful fortune may exhort the wise / Only to wonder at unlawful things" (*Dr. Faustus*, Epil. 5-6). The moral value of the *de casibus* ending lies in this differentiation between wisdom and folly, good and evil. But, in dilating the end, Marlowe disturbingly blurs the ultimate differentiation between good and evil. The pleasure of Marlovian tragedy lies in precisely this play of *differance*, in Marlowe's transformational deferring of, and differing from, the moral signified of *de casibus* tragedy.

None of Marlowe's plays more clearly points up the arbitrary nature of the process of tragic signification than The Jew of Malta. Through his criminal hero Barabas, Marlowe invites what one critic calls our "engagement with knavery" (Jones 63-98). The Jew of Malta exemplifies Marlowe's parodic and anti-moralistic transformations of tragedy elsewhere in his oeuvre, for, as Thomas Cartelli has shown, the play as a brand of burlesque theatre "offers [Marlowe's] audience the prospect of endless play without engendering in that audience the fear of having its collective hand slapped" (118). And yet the lineaments of tragedy remain distinct in the play. In fact, as Barabas is made to pay for the sin of Maltese society, Marlowe uses his caricature of the "bottle-nosed" Jew to uncover the scapegoat mechanism of Renaissance tragedy. Barabas eludes the morally clear-cut resolution of de casibus tragedy, both by deferring that end through a series of false resurrections and by bringing into focus the fundamental lack of differentiation between socially instituted categories that lead to his destruction. The Maltese governor's conversion of Barabas to a scapegoat-figure who ostensibly suffers and dies "To save the ruin of a multitude" (I.ii.976)[1] does more than "belabour" Christianity, as G. K. Hunter argues ("Theology" 101). The tragic play of difference between Jew, Christian, and Turk, though it assuredly satirizes the lack of charity in the Christian, more importantly challenges the very boundary between faith and heresy. Whom we should accept and whom refuse becomes the central question of Marlowe's play. Despite critics' attempts at moral differentiation, Marlowe's answer--the signified towards which readers versed in the *de casibus* tradition instinctively reach--remains ambiguous, suspended in a textual chain of signification. This chapter charts Marlowe's moral ambiguity (shown in his departure from conventional *de casibus* tragedy) by exploring the way in which Barabas and, to a lesser extent, the Guise in *The Massacre at Paris* function as parodic scapegoats.

i.

In the context of literary studies, the term "scapegoat" signifies the mechanism whereby the sacrifice or expulsion of an individual from society accomplishes a collective healing or redemption.[2] The scapegoat is intimately connected with theories of tragic catharsis, which hold that the action of expelling a central character effectively purges evil not only from the fictional society (by achieving a "resolution" or restoration of social order in the play itself) but also from the society represented by the audience (by purging the dangerous emotions of pity and fear from individual members). The importance of the scapegoat both as a central theme and as a structural principle in *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris* is suggested in the plays' very titles, which particularize the social setting and hence imply the social dimension of tragedy's sacrificial deaths.

That dimension would have been obvious to a Renaissance writer and his audience, for the tenet that the exemplary actions of a sacrificed or erring individual can create unity for the social body underlies Renaissance notions of tragedy. Drama in performance possesses not only the physical effect of unifying individuals into a single communal body, but also, as Renaissance critics hint, the power to secure communal order. In his _Apology for Actors_ (1612), Heywood speaks for his age when he stresses drama as a binding social force:

> plays are written with this aim and carried with this method: to teach subjects obedience to their king, to show the people the untimely ends of such as have moved tumults, commotions, and insurrections; to present them with the flourishing estate of such as live in obedience, exhorting them to allegiance, dehorting them from all traitorous and felonious stratagems.
>
> (558)

Tragedy only exaggerates or heightens the exemplary method of drama, for by showing "the fatal and abortive ends of such as commit notorious murder," it aims to "terrify men from the like abhorred practices" (Heywood, _Apology_ 558). The moral value of tragedy, its ability to foster a well-ordered commonwealth composed of virtuous subjects, is a Renaissance critical commonplace. Much Renaissance criticism counters Plato's criticism that tragedy impairs the collective morality of the Republic with Aristotle's supposed emphasis in the Poetics on the moral utility of tragic catharsis.[3] Faced with the central question of Renaissance tragic criticism--whether tragedy exists for pleasure or utility--Castelvetro, in his translation and commentary on the Poetics, insists upon the delight of the genre, but points out that Aristotle gives tragedy a single powerful utility: "namely the bringing about of the purgation of terror and compassion" (349). Renaissance literary criticism follows Aristotle in regarding tragedy as "the imitation of an action." But, whereas for Aristotle and Greek tragedians tragedy could end happily or unhappily, for Marlowe and most of his contemporaries the genre is defined by its emphasis on "fatal and abortive ends." It is the story of tragic actions, the plot of lives terminating in a pitiable and terrifying manner, that brings about a purification and release of communal evil. Even those critics who stress the pleasure or "delight" of tragedy insist upon its end--retributive and hence cathartic--as the single most powerfully moral feature of the genre.

Through Barabas, Marlowe turns Renaissance tragic theory, along with Christian exegesis of the scapegoat, on its head. The Jew of Malta presents a parody of the scapegoating process because Barabas's expulsion (along with the sacrifice of the purer Abigail) performs no real catharsis or purgation of evil. Rather, as most recent criticism of the play argues, Ferneze's hypocrisy at the end of the play shows that Malta remains sin-infested; despite attempts to externalize and detach it, evil remains within Ferneze and his society.[4] The ironic black humour throughout Marlowe's play is also anticathartic, and prevents the audience from feeling, or releasing, genuine pity or fear concerning the fate of Barabas (or any other character). But Barabas chiefly prevents tragic catharsis through his evocative role as ironic scapegoat, through which Marlowe parodies the Judeo-Christian notion of atonement and redemption.

Marlowe achieves his parody of tragic sacrifice in The Jew in part by presenting a mimesis of what must be in a Christian context the consummate tragedy of sacrifice, Christ's Passion. Merely by placing Barabas centre-stage, Marlowe evokes the trial which led to Christ's atoning crucifixion.[5] Elizabethan readers, conditioned by prolonged exposure to sermons, Bible readings, and even mystery plays, would undoubtedly invest the character with an overdetermined significance by virtue of the important role his namesake plays at Christ's trial. Barabas thus enters Marlowe's play trailing his Christian significance behind him. In order to understand Marlowe's parody of the scapegoat-mechanism through Barabas, we must first outline the function of the mechanism in Christ's trial, and in the typologically related Hebrew ritual of atonement.

Although it has gained widest currency in modern structuralist criticism of tragedy, the term "scapegoat" originates in Renaissance Biblical hermeneutics; but in the latter context, too, the scapegoat is seen as an essential agent in bringing about the purgation of sin or evil and the redemption of society. Tyndale first uses the word in his 1530 translation of Leviticus 16:8, in a passage which details the Hebrew ritual on the Day of Atonement. In order to purify itself of sin, Israel is commanded to take two goats, kill one by slitting its throat under running water, and send the other, carrying Israel's collective sins on its back, into the wilderness. The tainted goat (the Hebrew "azazel") that thus escapes into the wilderness Tyndale dubs the "scape goote." In the Jewish tradition, the two goats procure annual atonement for society's sins through the acts of sacrifice and substitution; in the Christian tradition, Jesus accomplishes, once and forever, both acts.

Structuralist critics such as Girard and Frye who set up Christ as the paradigm of the literary scapegoat-figure take their cue from traditional Biblical hermeneutics. In the Renaissance, the Zurich minister Henry Bullinger calls the Hebrew ritual of atonement a "most pleasant glass" wherein is "figured the whole passion, and effect of the passion, of Jesus Christ" (194). Bullinger stresses the absolute sufficiency of Christ as the antitype both of the sacrificed goat and of the scapegoat: "The two goats do signify Christ our Lord, very God and very man, in two natures unseparated. He is slain, and dieth in his humanity; but is not slain nor dieth in his divinity" (196). What is most fascinating about Bullinger's treatment of the scapegoat is that he implicitly links it to tragic theories of catharsis. Alluding to the inferior representations of sacrifice offered by "stage-plays" (194) and by Greek "cleansings or purgings of the people" (197), Bullinger insists that Christ alone can provide true atonement for sin: "all the sins of God's universal church, are by the one and only sacrifice, once only offered, most perfectly blotted out and absolutely purged" (199). In Bullinger's account, Christ's Passion recommends itself as the perfect tragedy. Indeed, it corresponds to the tenet of Renaissance tragic criticism that the actions of the tragic hero should "blot out" sin or purify the spectators, specifically of pity and fear, thus "dehorting them from traitorous and fellonious stratagems," as Heywood puts it.

Any literary account of a scapegoat-figure who is sacrificed, literally or symbolically, to restore social unity possesses a mythical affinity with the Hebrew ritual and with the related story of Christ's Passion. In the Christian tradition, a guilty scapegoat (like Barabbas) might well function to parody Christ's sinless sacrifice. Indeed, even in Gospel accounts, Barabbas appears as a parody of the atoning Hebrew scapegoat, a fact which suggestively impinges on Marlowe's portrait of his Barabas. As Bullinger suggests, the two goats--which symbolically join in the fullness of Christ--represent the two contrary acts of death and rebirth, immolation and liberation. Hobbes in Leviathan similarly argues that Christ "was both the sacrificed Goat, and the Scape Goat . . . . sacrificed, in that he dyed; and escaping, in his Resurrection, being raised opportunely by his Father, and removed from the habitation of men in his Ascension" (513-14). Christ fulfills the scapegoat role at the Crucifixion by demonstrating his atoning power to purge the world of sin, even to the extent of removing sin beyond human habitation. However, a parodic scapegoat-figure is also present at the trial of Christ, in the person of Barabbas, the thief and murderer whom the Jews unknowingly release into the wide wilderness of history. The choice that Pilate gives the Jews, to condemn either Jesus or Barabbas, becomes in Christian doctrine the ultimate choice between the spirit and the flesh, a choice upon which salvation or damnation depends. The Gospels' record of Christ's sacrifice, and of Barabbas's release (if not of his exile), implicitly mirrors the Hebrew two-goat ritual. Yet if Barabbas, like the second Hebrew goat, escapes death and is released to a new life, in orthodox terms this extension of physical life only parodies the inner rebirth of a true Christian conversion. Although Christ ostensibly remains the true scapegoat, who takes away the sins of the world, Barabbas in typological terms functions as his demonic double, the false scapegoat forever unredeeming, condemned by the choice of his people.[6]

As Renaissance sermons and religious writing show, the Jews' decision to release Barabbas provides the chief incitement for a long tradition of Christian antisemitism. In the history of Christianity, not only does Barabbas bear the heavy load of perceived Jewish sinfulness on his back, but the Jews themselves become scapegoated in the name of the "true" scapegoat, Christ. Even the Gospel account of Matthew depicts the Jews, more than Pilate, stained with blood, calling down upon themselves the condemnation of the world: "His blood be on us, and on our children" (27:25). The Geneva Bible glosses this verse: "And as they wished, so this curse taketh place to this day." But Marlowe's The Jew of Malta challenges this received antisemitism, while at the same time encouraging our participation in the Jew-baiting of Barabas. Of course, on other occasions Marlowe is reported to have challenged traditional interpretations of Christ's life and trial: according to Richard Baines's testimony, Marlowe maintained "That Christ deserved better to dy than Barabbas, and that the Jewes made a good choise, although Barabbas were both a theif and a murtherer." Such a convention-breaking statement, though shocking when placed in the context of Marlowe's firmly entrenched Christian society, is consonant with Marlowe's manipulation of tragic convention throughout his dramatic corpus.

ii.

In The Jew of Malta, Marlowe's use of the Barabbas incident from the Gospels forcefully underscores the antisemitism of the Maltese society of Christians.[7] If Barabas has more lines than any other Marlovian character, his name (one of those magical Marlovian amphimacers described by Harry Levin [93]), also rings throughout the play, calling forth Gospel associations with the thief and murderer who escaped death. Although Barabas's biblical namesake is never explicitly mentioned in the play, Marlowe creates a network of subtle biblical allusions to Christ's Passion that keep Barabas's mythical scapegoat role always in view.[8]

One of the Knights of Malta, for example, refers to the very verse in Matthew which has the Jews declare that Christ's blood shall be on their descendants' heads. The Maltese government uses this supposed "curse" to justify its ill treatment of Barabas in robbing him of his goods:

> If your first curse fall heavy on thy head,
> And make thee poor and scorn'd of all the world,
> 'Tis not our fault, but thy inherent sin . . . .
> (I.ii.107-109)

Barabas's reply hints that the Knights of Maltese use the Gospel account to manipulate citizens out of their goods. Rather than refute the grounds on which they continue to persecute "castaway" Jews, Barabas appeals to his rights as an individual:

> What? bring you scripture to confirm your wrongs?
> Preach me not out of my possessions.
> Some Jews are wicked, as all Christians are:
> But say the tribe that I descended of
> Were all in general cast away for sin,
> Shall I be tried by their transgression?
> The man that dealeth righteously shall live:
> And which of you can charge me otherwise?
> (I.ii.110-117)

Barabas's words point to the prejudice of a government that will condemn him without trial for the supposed sins of his race; however, Marlowe's complex parody also satirizes Barabas in the very act of setting himself up as scapegoat. For Barabas clearly demonstrates his own prejudice against "all Christians." Nonetheless, Barabas's final question about his degree of innocence or guilt directs itself outward, to the audience. From what we have seen of him, Barabas scarcely seems a model of the righteous man, even in Jewish terms; but we cannot in fairness "charge" him with transgression of the law at this point in the play. Certainly, his powerless position in relation to the "unrelenting" Christians (I.ii.141) calls forth the sympathy due the underdog. On the other hand, however, Ferneze and his Knights occupy a similar position in relation to the Turks, in the preceding scene of the play, and while they are stripping Barabas of his goods, Marlowe continually reminds us of their own subjection to Turkish rule.

This ambivalent situation between Barabas and the Maltese governors in I.ii offers a paradigm for Marlowe's technique throughout the entire play. Faced with a mimesis of the original choice between Barabbas and Christ (displaced, in this case, to become a choice between the avaricious Jew, Barabas, and the equally grasping Maltese Christians), we find ourselves hard pressed to decide. The very act of choosing implicates us in the processes of persecution.

Throughout the play, Marlowe develops a hierarchy of master-slave relations that keeps the line between persecutor and persecuted fluid (rather than fixed, as it is in standard interpretations of the Passion). The Turks, led by Calymath, oppress the Maltese Christians by robbing Barabas, who takes partial revenge first through his vassal-like daughter, and then through his freshly-bought Turkish slave. But the oppressed soon become the oppressors: the Maltese governors, on Del Bosco's advice, wage war on the Turks, while Ithamore blackmails and destroys Barabas. Abigail alone chooses self-mortification, and for that reason is the only "virtuous" character critics have been able to single out.[9] But even Abigail's final religious "profession" of nunhood is luridly coloured by the lechery and hypocrisy of her Catholic colleagues, and her example of sacrifice shines dimly indeed. In the world of the play Marlowe so mixes virtue and vice, victim and victimizer, that he renders impossible the choice between Jew, Christian, and Turk (represented by the duplicitous Ithamore, if not by Calymath and company).

For all the playful lack of moral differentiation between what seem increasingly to be self-serving religious factions brought together in the community of Malta, the outlines of the tragic scapegoat-mechanism are clearly visible in the play. Marlowe's parody of Christ's Passion surfaces most explicitly in I.ii, where it is linked with a parody of Job (himself often seen as a prefiguration of Christ). Ferneze emerges as a persecutor, cast in the role of the Jewish high priest Caiaphas who "prophecied that Jesus should die for the nation [Israel]; / And not for the nation onely, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God, which were scattered" (John 11:51-52). According to John's Gospel, Caiaphas's prediction that Jesus would in essence perform the role of sacrificial scapegoat and create unity for the Jewish nation led (ironically, of course) to the crucifixion of Christ (John 11:53). Indeed, in his account of the crucifixion, John reminds us of Caiaphas's prophecy: "And Caiaphas was he, that gave counsel to the Jewes, that it was expedient that one man should die for the people" (John 18:14). In showing Ferneze as a persecutor looking for a scapegoat, Marlowe has him echo Caiaphas:

> . . . Jew, we take particularly thine
> To save the ruin of a multitude:
> And better one want for a common good,
> Than many perish for a private man.
>
> (I.ii.96-99)

Admittedly, Ferneze differs from the crucifying high priest because he does not stoop "To take the lives of miserable men"; but, because the Governor contents himself instead to "be the causers of their misery," Barabas esteems the "injury" greater than death (I.ii.146-148). Ferneze's political justification, his argument that Barabas must suffer to save society's ruin and that this suffering is excusable to secure "a common good," brings the tragic scapegoat-mechanism into focus.

A further implicit comparison of Ferneze with Pilate strengthens the Maltese governor's position as persecutor, and at first seems to support a reading of Barabas as a type of Christ-like scapegoat. Ferneze recalls Pilate's scapegoating of Christ when he says, "Barabas, to stain our hands with blood / Is far from us and our profession" (I.ii.144-145): several critics have heard in these words an echo of the Roman governor who sealed Christ's crucifixion but "washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man" (Matt. 27:24). And yet, while Ferneze's political skill matches that of the consummately careful yet efficient Governor in the Gospels, the play turns the Biblical allusion into a playful parody of the scapegoating process. Barabas seems no wholly "innocent" or "just person." Certainly, his earlier question concerning which fault he might be "charged" with had echoed Christ's words to the Pharisees, "Which of you can rebuke me of sinne?" (John 8:46; see Sims 20, and Deats 35). But his later echoes of Christ, well outlined by Deats (29-31), place Barabas in the parodic role of Antichrist, so that he "obviously represents an inversion of all Christian values" (Deats, "Biblical Parody" 31).[10]

Barabas parodies not only Christ's tragic sacrifice but also Job's tragic trial of patience. In addition to drawing a parallel to Job through Barabas's comfortless session with three friends, Marlowe has these friends in turn advise, "brother Barabas, remember Job" (I.ii.180), and "Good Barabas, be patient" (I.ii.199). Ignoring the advice, Marlowe's afflicted Jew inverts Job's proverbial patience and faith.[11] Despite his echoes of Job (I.ii.182-185; I.ii.197-98), Barabas remembers the archetypal tragic hero only to the extent of enumerating "his wealth" (I.ii.181) and lamenting that he possessed even more than Job at the original height of his prosperity.

And yet, parody aside, Barabas's several echoes of the most moving words from the tragic tale of Job evokes a measure of sympathy for Marlowe's protagonist. His tragic features emerge as he mourns, "only I have toil'd to inherit here / The months of vanity and loss of time, / And painful nights have been appointed me" (I.ii.196-198; cf. Job 7:3). And Marlowe further complicates our ambivalence towards Barabas and Ferneze, our difficulty in deciding which is the virtuous "sign" in the play, by encouraging his biblically literate audience to twist the tale of Job in another ironic direction: if Barabas has been stripped of his goods, the adversarial "Satan" figure whom God, the great "_Primus_ _Motor_" (I.ii.164) has allowed to torture him is Ferneze (cf. Job 1:6-12).

One critic reads the network of biblical reference in _The Jew of Malta_ as a "series of moral standards against which the squalid society of Malta can be evaluated" (Deats 27). But Marlowe's use of biblical allusion to adumbrate the spiritually hollow, slapstick actions of Maltese citizens functions not so much to provide a satiric norm as to parody tragic convention: namely, the conventional plot of sacrifice and atonement, with its pious epilogue. Given the evocation of biblical tragic sacrifice, especially in the early scenes, it is hardly astonishing that a nineteenth-century performance rewrote Marlowe's Jew of Malta to conform to the conventional outlines of serious tragedy.[12] Nor, on the other hand, should we be surprised by the numerous performances of the play which exaggerate the parodic elements, following T. S. Eliot's lead, who described the play as a "savage" farce ("Christopher Marlowe" 123).[13] Indeed, critics apparently unable to reconcile Marlowe's sacrosanct tragic allusions with his parodic treatment of those allusions have pointed to the play's failure or weakness, and even to its two distinct halves: F. P. Wilson exemplifies the critical dissatisfaction with the kaleidoscopic text when he complains that the last three acts "belong to a different world of art" (65). The critical, editorial, and directorial complaints about the play testify loudly to Marlowe's success at defamiliarizing the convention of tragic sacrifice by overlaying it with comic parody.

Marlowe's most elaborate parody of Biblical tragedy occurs when he "releases" Barabas, in a Caiaphas- or Pilate-like gesture, through two self-conscious, dilatory reprieves. Although the best example of this dilation is the false de casibus ending in the opening scene of Act V, Marlowe anticipates that comic reversal by an earlier binary movement of tragic suffering followed by comic restoration. After being stripped of his goods, two short scenes later Barabas, like Job, has regained them through Marlowe's dilatory reversal of tribulation, so that he may boast having "become as wealthy as [he] was" (II.iii.11). Barabas's own ironic restoration, of course, has little to do with his imputed righteousness, despite Ferneze's earlier smug promise to him: "If thou rely upon thy righteousness, / Be patient and thy riches will increase" (I.ii.121-122). In fact, Barabas's increased riches only make Ferneze's promise more theologically suspect. Rather than provide a moral standard against which we can judge Barabas's restoration of wealth, Marlowe's allusion to Job's ultimately comedic conclusion may imply a playful testing of an all-too-standard, self-interested reading of Job as a lesson to persist in religious profession for material profit. Ferneze's equation of prosperity with righteousness is, after all, inherent in the Biblical account of Job's end, which indeed theologians in our century have confirmed is textually suspect.[14]

After undergoing what seems at least a marginally tragic episode of suffering, the replenished Barabas vows revenge on his Christian government, and the play in a sense begins again, now becoming a burlesque version of a revenge-play. Ferneze announces this new beginning by vowing revenge himself on the Turks. The Job-like aspects of Barabas's character disappear as he transforms into a parodic Antichrist-figure, learning to fit himself to the stereotyped antisemitic role in which Maltese society had placed him from the beginning.[15] The initial characteristic that had defined him as a stereotypical Jew --avarice--gives way to a murderous vengefulness against Christians, a trait antisemitic Europe associated with Jews: Barabas becomes a killing, poisoning, "extorting" villain (II.iii.192) well-versed in the science of poisoning and dangerous "physic" (II.iii.182).

And yet, suggesting (like other revenge villains) his affinities with the Vice of medieval morality plays, Barabas continues to elicit the interested support, if not the sympathy, of most audience members. Though disapproving of the grotesquely drawn Jew, even the nineteenth-century critic Charles Lamb admitted the popular appeal of Marlowe's portrait when he recognized: "Barabas is a mere monster brought in with a large painted nose to please the rabble" (Specimens 31). By encouraging us to root for Barabas against the Maltese, Marlowe makes us complicit in the violence of the Jew; but our competing inclination to root for the Maltese against the Turks places us on the side of law and order, so that we also abhor Barabas's violence and almost instinctively desire his punishment and expulsion from society. In The Jew of Malta, as in The Massacre at Paris, Marlowe acts as rabble-rouser, stirring up our mob instincts both to overthrow those in power and to scapegoat the one who represents our own dangerous usurping potential.

Marlowe does indeed bring Barabas in "to please the rabble," subjected under the stifling hierarchy of the Renaissance economic and political power-structure. Barabas, like Marlowe's other climbing middle-class protagonists Tamburlaine and Faustus, explodes that notion of Degree given such a poetic consecration by the famous speech of Shakespeare's Ulysses in Troilus and Cressida (I.iii.82-129). Barabas explodes as well the order of de casibus tragedy, whose retributive ending seeks to contain and condemn the subversive elements represented by this regenerating Jew.

Marlowe again releases Barabas, thereby prolonging the play of subversion and containment, when he dilates with remarkable skill the conventional de casibus ending. Marlowe counterfeits another ending for Barabas by staging the Jew's arrest for multiple crimes against Christians (which comprise the arrangement of Lodowick's and Mathias's deaths; the murder of Friar Barnardine and the framing of Friar Jacomo; and the poisoning of the nuns, including his own daughter Abigail). As he is dragged off to prison, Barabas--ever the Jewish stereotype, calling for "law" (V.i.38)--screams at his accusers, "Devils, do your worst! I live in spite of you!" (V.i.41). Not only has the play manifested Barabas's restorative power once before, but it has also seduced us into complicity with his subversive power, so that we both expect and long for his escape from the ending prescribed by _de casibus_ law. The off-stage death of Barabas only strengthens our hope, as Marlowe builds our incredulity into the text. Ferneze and Del Bosco themselves cannot believe the "strange" and "sudden" prison deaths of Barabas, Ithamore, Bellamira, and Pilia-Borza. Even Barabas's body, carried onstage "_as dead_," does not provide sufficient evidence. Given the demonic energy of Marlowe's Jew, the play seems over all too soon.

In fact, Marlowe keeps the game of dilation in play. Heather Dubrow, in her useful study _Genre_, sketches the dilatory power of Barabas's escape from death in this scene of _The Jew of Malta_. Ferneze's "dogmatic speech," offered over the body of Barabas "_as dead_," fools the audience, as Dubrow argues, precisely because it conforms to _de casibus_ convention (28). Our study of _de casibus_ tragedy certainly confirms that Barabas's fall through overreaching ambition, and Ferneze's speech emphasizing "the moral implications of his fall," constitute standard features of the genre (28). Dubrow most suggestively characterizes the moral ambiguity of _The Jew of Malta_, and indeed of Marlowe's entire corpus:

> By bringing into play our memories of works in the de casibus tradition, Marlowe is inviting us to compare the pat morality of such drama with his own very different and very disturbing vision. Rosalie Colie's suggestive observation that Shakespeare often turns his commentary on literary forms into a commentary on moral assumptions (Shakespeare's Living Art, pp. 26ff.) also describes the practice of Marlowe and, of course, of so many writers as well.
>
> (Genre 28)

As Dubrow suggests, Marlowe's use of a parodic de casibus speech has important implications for our understanding of his text's moral ambiguity--its creation of a dilatory space where divisions dissolve. The "very different and very disturbing" Marlovian tragic vision uncovers our desire for a "divine" retribution, for the scapegoat promised us; but in The Jew of Malta, Marlowe both intensifies and defers that desire. Barabas as scapegoat slips through Ferneze's hands, and through ours as well.

The false ending, with Barabas's second escape from the rigours of Maltese and de casibus law, confirms Barabas's scapegoat role in the play. At this point Barabas seems the poisonous substance that must be expelled in order to purge the state of evil. He has in fact become soaked in all manner of bloody sin. Ferneze commands the literal as well as symbolic expulsion of Barabas from the city, and suggests the link between that expulsion and the fortification of Malta. Evoking de casibus theories of divine retribution, the Governor ironically attributes Barabas's sudden death to heaven's justice:

> Wonder not at it, sir, the heavens are just:
> Their deaths were like their lives; then think
> not of 'em.
> Since they are dead, let them be buried.
> For the Jew's body, throw that o'er the walls,
> To be a prey for vultures and wild beasts.
> So, now away, and fortify the town.
> (V.i.55-60)

Since he is still the foreign substance that threatens the corporate unity of Malta, Barabas receives a disposal outside the city "walls." As a tragic scapegoat-figure, he has infiltrated the community, transgressing within its walls and pressing against its moral boundaries, but his place is outside the polis.

Indeed, Ferneze had originally accused the Jews of having caused the Turks to oppress Malta for the overdue tribute money, as he incriminated them with the help of faintly veiled religious rhetoric:

> For through our sufferance of your hateful lives,
> Who stand accursed in the sight of heaven,
> These taxes and afflictions are befall'n,

> And therefore thus we are determined . . . .
>
> (I.ii.63-66).

Ferneze's prejudicial tax-reform law charges the Jews alone with responsibility for Malta's economic and political problems. The Jewish "infidels" deserve, under Maltese law, heavy tax penalties so that "true" citizens remain exempt. The Jews are foreigners: Barabas himself, like Ferneze, classifies his people as "strangers" in a strange land (I.ii.59, 60). Though he is a criminal, Barabas in his ejection over the walls of the city also seems merely a token scapegoat for the "accursed" sins of his people, his body not even meriting the burial accorded the other criminals. It is only possible to "fortify the town" once the foreign substance is finally outside the city where it belongs.

Or is it? Is Barabas outside or inside? Is the order of the polis fortified or crumbling? Left for dead, Barabas leaps up reanimated, taking the audience into his confidence again:

> What, all alone? well fare, sleepy drink.
> I'll be revenged on this accursed town,
> For by my means Calymath shall enter in.
>
> (V.i.61-63)

Far from "alone," as a true exiled scapegoat would be, Barabas enlists our complicity in his last, grandest revenge-plot. Marlowe calls attention to his own deft string-pulling, having Calymath and his Turkish generals choose that moment to enter Malta and congratulate Barabas on his performance of a parodic resurrection. Surely the line by which the regenerated man identifies himself to the Turks--"My name is Barabas; I am a Jew" (V.i.72)--resonates with irony, given the discrepancy between Barabbas's traditional associations and the character's zestful reappropriation in Marlowe's hands. In a characteristic dilatory move that evades the law of tragedy, Marlowe brings the expelled scapegoat back inside the walls which have attempted to separate "stranger" from citizen. As if to leave no mistake that he fulfills the function of his biblical original, the "notable prisoner, called Barabbas" (Matt. 27:16), Barabas reminds us, "I was imprison'd, but escaped their hands" (77).

Thanks to Barabas, other strangers enter the city (ironically, through its "common channels" or sewers [88]). The Turks who seize Malta completely upset the sociopolitical hierarchy. Their entrance into the town prolongs the dialectical play between oppositional categories ("Jew" and "Christian") which Malta has "fortified" in order to protect Degree and itss attendant privileges. And the Turks, even more significantly, introduce a third counter ("Turk") into the game of religious difference, a new development which increases the difficulty of deciphering the other two. As Barabas makes good on his vow "to see the governor a slave" (V.i.67), the play opens up an entirely new, far more hazy, narrative horizon.

iii.

In Dido, Marlowe dilates the expected end of his Queen by playfully suggesting that Aeneas will stay in Carthage to build the Empire; in The Jew of Malta, similarly, Marlowe dilates the de casibus end and gives his traditionally scapegoated protagonist an alternative future that suggests affinities with the wish-fulfillment dreams of comedy and romance. With a self-conscious defiance of convention that we have come to associate with all his works, Marlowe temporarily pushes the law of tragedy itself outside his text, but it lurks on the borders. What we have called the Marlovian play of differance stops--even reverses--the tragic process of singling out and destroying a scapegoat.

With the Turks and Barabas the Jew in the position of conqueror, Ferneze is forced to say that he and his fellow Christians "are captives and must yield" (V.ii.6). In a defamiliarizing twist of revenge-play and de casibus convention, Marlowe gratifies the avenger's desires and transfigures the retributive law of tragedy into a parodic instrument of the law-breaker. It is Ferneze who offers up a Job-like plaint:

> O, fatal day, to fall into the hands
> Of such a traitor and unhallowed Jew!
> What greater misery could heaven inflict?
> (V.i.12-14)

The outlaw Barabas now rises to the position of not simply citizen but, astonishingly, Governor of Malta. And yet the former oppositional categories of persecutor and persecuted, rather than simply reversing themselves, become enmeshed and confounded together. In V.ii. confusion reigns, as Barabas boasts to Ferneze about having "now at length . . . grown your governor" (V.ii.70), but at the same time insists on calling Ferneze himself "governor." Furthermore, although he addresses Barabas as "My lord" (49), Ferneze seems still to command the Jew; and Marlowe emphasizes the confounding of the lines of authority by having the doubled governors echo each other through a pair of matching imperatives:

> FERNEZE.
> Nay, more, do this, and live thou governor still.
> BARABAS.
> Nay, do thou this, Ferneze, and be free.

As the scapegoat Barabas metamorphoses into a parodic Pilate-figure, he demonstrates the danger of his duplicitous (that is, doubling) subversion of power. Barabas, indeed, evokes what Girard would call a "crisis of Degree" ("Levi-Strauss" 34), figured forth in Pilate's own question, "What is truth?" The suspicion arises that the two governors vying for power, competing to be recognized for opposing versions of "truth," are both Pilate-figures. But for now the need to isolate a scapegoat seems temporarily blunted, and for two final scenes Marlowe holds tragedy at a standstill.

Barabas of course finally suffers retribution, as the familiar order of Maltese society reasserts itself. Despite having blurred the boundary between "Us" and "Them" throughout the play, Marlowe now shows the Christians as more than conquerors. Barabas falls, in a "true" theologically and generically sound ending, and feels the "intolerable pangs" (V.v.87) of his own construction, a hellishly "deep pit past recovery" (V.i.36). Ferneze, emerging as the "true" revenger and governor, sees Barabas's "treachery repaid" (V.v.73). But when Ferneze utters a second de casibus speech over Barabas's dead body, we cannot help but feel the unsettling vibrations not only of the first speech but also of the other Degree-collapsing incidents in the play. Not surprisingly, Ferneze holds up Barabas as an example of "the unhallowed deeds of Jews" (V.v.91). Turk and Christian come together only for a moment before Ferneze apprehends Calymath to "live in Malta prisoner" (V.v.118), after which act a "natural" Christian order restores itself within city-walls.

Ferneze appears the exemplary Christian governor, perhaps even an exemplar of Christ, as he deftly separates sheep from goats and intones, "So march away, and let due praise be given / Neither to fate nor fortune, but to heaven" (V.v.123). The play complicates our own act of judgment and separation, however, by suggesting the partiality (that is, the artificial and politically motivated nature) of this heaven. Marlowe confounds received notions of religious truth by suspending categories in a chain of signification that has the effect of demystifying religion in general. The Jew of Malta, by comparison with other Marlovian plays, seems hollow at the core because Malta is devoid of morality.

Abigail, the Hebrew turned Christian who herself confounds categories, perceives the void when she laments, "there is no love on earth, / Pity in Jews, nor piety in Turks" (III.iii.47-48). She also feels the vertigo caused by a world upside down: "now experience, purchased with grief, / Hath made me see the difference of things" (III.iii.61-62). Abigail converts to Christianity through an act of separation, by erecting a new wall (the wall of the nunnery) to separate truth from falsehood, and by expelling the old testament, like a scapegoat, into what she calls "The fatal labyrinth of misbelief" (III.iii.64) where she once wandered. And yet the text itself resembles the serpentine twists of that labyrinth. "Misbelief," not faith, is the focus of Marlowe's play. In his world of experience, the walls separating truth and falsehood crumble: "the difference of things" threatens to "raze the city walls" and "Lay waste the island, hew the temples down" (III.v.13-14). Despite their carefully constructed divisions, Jew, Turk, and Christian are alike in their thirst for murderous revenge.

Barabas, like his daughter, insists on "difference" and underscores his own separation from Christians through repeated references to his circumcision and their consumption of pork (II.iii.7-8). Yet the Maltese Christians emphasize the same division between blessed and cursed, clean and unclean, as it were. Moments before Barabas says to Ithamore, "Both circumcised, we hate Christians both" (II.iii.216), Katherine cautions her son Mathias not to speak with Barabas because "he is cast off from heaven" (II.iii.159). Even the familiar separation in the Bible between those who receive divine blessing and those who suffer the curse of divine retribution cannot help fix a moral or spiritual norm in this play, since Barabas uses equally the blessed Abraham (II.ii.231) and the accursed Cain (II.iii.302) to condemn Christians.

Barabas expresses the playful blurring of religious difference when he inverts the conventional Christian categories of law and trangression, faith and heresy:

> It's no sin to deceive a Christian,
> For they themselves hold it a principle

> Faith is not to be held with heretics;
> But all are heretics that are not Jews . . . .
> (II.iii.310-313)

These lines might well grate on Elizabethan sensibilities, even as audience members respond with a measure of delight to Barabas's Vice-like shattering of moral convention. Through Barabas, Marlowe shows the shifting lines of religion and morality. If the Jew reconfigures "law" so as to redefine "sin," and reconfigures "faith" so as to redefine "heresy," he makes the boundary between virtue and vice, inside and outside, a permeable one. Marlowe's movement back and forth across that permeable barrier insistently calls into question Elizabethan religious and moral systems, which rely upon clearly defined notions of "inside" and "outside."

Barabas's redefinition of heresy complicates still further received Elizabethan notions. The tenet that one could with impunity break faith with heretics was a notoriously Catholic one. In _The Massacre at Paris_, where the play of difference involves Catholic and Protestant rather than Jew and Christian, Marlowe forcefully shows that Protestants themselves became defined as heretics when placed within the Catholic system. In a Catholic world like Renaissance France, for example, Huguenot Protestants are "infidels" and "strangers," placed in the ironically "unchosen" position of Barabas. One of the sources for

Marlowe's Massacre at Paris, a translated version of Jean de Serres' account of France's civil wars makes precisely this point: "Remember that this is a decree of the Catholikes confirmed by authoritie, That there is no faith to be kept with Heretikes: by which name they of the religion [Huguenots] are specially called" (Fourth Parte x.18). One need only cross the border, in other words, to become the foreign element that must be expelled in the name of unity. Marlowe's testimony of the sociopolitical systems which manufacture and sacrifice scapegoats on the sham altar of religious necessity gains even greater force when we consider The Jew of Malta, briefly, in light of The Massacre at Paris.

iv.

Marlowe's use of (not to mention personal experience with) the scapegoat-mechanism, which condemns individuals in order to refortify difference, helps to explain The Massacre at Paris, a play which disturbs our modern sensibilities and seems at first difficult to assimilate into the Marlovian canon. Paul Kocher is one of the few critics who has tackled this lamentably corrupt text. In a series of three articles (1941-1945), Kocher meticulously outlines the contemporary pamphlet backgrounds of The Massacre at Paris, concluding with some disgust that "The crudeness and extreme prejudice of most of these views explain in large measure why the drama is the crass and violently partisan thing it is" ("Part Two" 318). Kocher's observations on the play are valid, and yet, given our acquired knowledge of Marlovian tragic convention, should we not delve deeper into the import of Marlowe's "violently partisan" vision? For in this carefully orthodox dramatic translation of foreign civil broils, Marlowe challenges, rather than merely tolerates, the system which encloses _him_ in its walls.

Even in its textually corrupt state, _The Massacre at Paris_ resembles _The Jew of Malta_ in being a play about difference, if not deferral. Julia Briggs takes an important first step in our understanding of Marlowe's atypical use of propaganda in the play when she locates the ironic questioning of that propaganda in the play's symmetrical representation of history, and of historical violence. Marlowe encourages us to draw up sides. The play begins with the "union and religious league" supposedly enacted by the marriage between Margaret, the sister of Charles IX of France (a Catholic), and Henry, King of Navarre (a Protestant). But even in the opening scene, that league is clearly in jeopardy, as Catherine, the Queen-Mother of France and a notoriously Machiavellian schemer, is vowing to "dissolve with blood and cruelty" the sham marriage of opposites.[16] She emphasizes, like Abigail, "our difference in religion" (i.15).

Marlowe makes a show of strengthening that religious difference at the conclusion of the play. The Protestant Henry of Navarre vows revenge on the see of Rome, thereby placing on its head the responsibility for the murder of Henry III and, implicitly, for the massacre of thousands of Protestants. Kocher sees this retributive ending as particularly flawed: the conquered Vice-figure, Guise, is one of Marlowe's typical "titans of evil"; but the conquering virtue is weak and colourless (it exhibits, in Kocher's suggestively male language, "extreme flaccidity and impotence" ["Hotman" 368]). Navarre is indeed devoid of the powerful rhetoric and overreaching ambition of the enemy opposition, represented by the compelling Duke of Guise ("Part One" 316). Kocher's recognition that throughout the play the finally triumphant Henry of Navarre "is the merest patchwork of Protestant commonplaces" ("Part One" 316) places suspicion on Marlowe's attitude towards the character and on its intended function, not on Marlowe's literary craft. The weakening of sympathy for one within the ranks of the audience, and the strengthening of admiration for one outside, suggests a weakening of the system by which English Protestantism maintains itself.

By making the Duke of Guise a demonic scapegoat-figure, Marlowe caters to Elizabethan popular tastes.[17] He releases a Barabas again in The Massacre at Paris, by "consciously, and perhaps cynically, pandering to the most brutal appetites and prejudices of the Elizabethan spectator" (Kocher, "Hotman" 368). At first glance, the Guise seems a clearly drawn scapegoat-figure who deserves his retributive end. The Protestants, while somewhat weak and unmemorable, emerge the victors over the bloody Guisians of France's civil war. But, even though Guise has been destroyed, having functioned as the poisonous substance that France needed to expel to work its remedy, the country remains in turmoil.

The Machiavellian Guise who masterminds the massacre of the Huguenots becomes, like Barabas, Vice-like in Marlowe's hands. Like the "Machevill" who speaks the Prologue in The Jew of Malta, the Guise "counts religion but a toy": in fact, in Paris as in Malta, Machiavellian "policy hath fram'd religion" (ii.65). As the overreaching character in the play, the Guise encourages our "engagement with knavery," as Jones puts it, although he also incites our own desire for murderous revenge by his massacre of countless Protestants. The "sweet violence" of tragedy, to echo Sidney's Defence, dissolves difference ("with blood and cruelty") even as it seeks to separate the obedient from the rebellious. In The Massacre at Paris, the difference between Catholic and Protestant, the heretic and the faithful, becomes ironically blurred in the Protestants final vow of bloody revenge. Henry III (Duke of Anjou, historically considered as a match for Elizabeth at one time) virtually converts to Protestantism. Stabbed by a friar--betrayed inside his walls by one of the Catholic faithful--the fatally wounded Henry III vows to destroy the Pope and his "antichristian kingdom" (xxi.61). With his last breath, Henry III salutes the "Queen of England," dying "her faithful friend" (xxi.106-107); by contrast, he swears eternal hatred to the Pope, promising to "fire accursed Rome about his ears," and again to "fire his crazed buildings, and enforce / The papal towers to kiss the lowly earth" (xxi.63-65). Likewise, the surviving heir to the throne, Henry of Navarre, takes up the cry to make "Rome, and all those popish prelates there, / . . . curse the time that e'er Navarre was king" (xxi.111-112). But these English "friends" only repeat the cry of Guise: "Tuez, tuez, tuez!" (v.62). The distance between king and tyrant is small indeed.

History, in a neat twist, cooperates with Marlowe in shattering the fortification of religious difference at the end of The Massacre, for England's friend Navarre ironically converted to Catholicism in July, 1593 (Bennett 252n110). This political development, which Marlowe could only have prophesied before his earlier death, brought the condemnation of Elizabeth. Although he became a stranger and infidel, by crossing that line Navarre (like Marlowe's fictional Henry III) calls into question its fixity.

Certainly, as a writer accused on occasion of leaning towards Catholicism, as a political agent under Elizabeth, and indeed a translator of Lucan's Pharsalia, Marlowe was well aware of the dangers of civil war and of its causes in religious difference. The Massacre at Paris, while ostensibly free of the parodic elements we found in The Jew of Malta, shares with that latter play a "terribly serious" theme, to echo T. S. Eliot (123). The violence of tragedy breaks down the walls we erect to separate Us from Them, chosen from unchosen. And the interplay of the two texts--the shifting relation of the Elizabethan audience to the religious camps in both plays--reinforces more disturbingly their implicit warning. We fortify the religious and political borders that we pretend are naturally fixed; our profession is, finally, policy.

The testimony of The Massacre at Paris prompts us to reformulate our questions about The Jew of Malta, for by crossing the borders of the text we trace and retrace the relational position of Marlowe's tragic subject within its system. Thus we recall that Marlowe's England fortified itself against Catholic influences. Marlowe himself was certainly well aware of the official treatment given to "outsider" Catholics, as is forcefully suggested by one of Acts of the Privy Council (29 June, 1587), which testifies that Marlowe had his M.A. degree conferred upon him through a striking "instance of governmental interference in academic affairs" (Bakeless I: 77). The government document admits to granting this remarkable act of intervention because "it was reported that Christopher Morley was determined to have gone beyond the seas to Reames and there to remaine" (qtd. in Bakeless I: 77). In order to prevent Marlowe--a reputed spy who himself traced and retraced the border between insider and outsider--from sharing his privileged information with the enemy, Elizabeth's government solidifies his position within English society. And yet the apparent act of grace can also serve as a grim, politically expedient reminder of the authoritarian power that circumscribes Marlowe.

The degree of "Christian-ness," after all, can easily be "dissolved in blood and cruelty" by the Protestants themselves (as Elizabeth's coincident 1587 martrydom of Mary, Queen of Scots, attests). Experience, alas, teaches us like Abigail of the "difference of things." Elizabeth could legislate in 1565 that prayers be offered up in support of the Knights of Malta against Turkish attack (Hunter, "Theology" 85), singling out the Turks as tyrannical and cruel "Infidels"; but she could also persecute the Catholic within her own borders. The difference between faith and heresy, inside and outside, seems shifting indeed, and profession even in England begins in Marlowe's view to look like policy.

Driving God out of his Jew of Malta, Marlowe ushers in Machiavelli. Placed in the context of the entire play, the

Prologue spoken by Machiavel establishes a link not only with the dangerous politicians of *The Massacre at Paris* but also with Elizabeth herself. The former link is explicit in one of Marlowe's sources, *The Fourth Parte of Commentaries of the Ciuill Warres of Fraunce* (1576), where Charles IX of France is said to be "*persuaded in the doctrine of* Machiauel, *howe that he ought not to suffer in his realme any other religion than that*, *upon the which his state standeth* . . . ." (20). Machiavelli's recognition of the political uses to which a unifying religion could be put inform *The Jew of Malta* and *The Massacre at Paris*, as does his insistence on the importance of hypocrisy (politic "profession") for the prudent prince. In both plays, although the foreign element (the individual outside the desired state religion) is expelled from the social body, his expulsion accomplishes no real catharsis, since the evil remains within. Ferneze, after all, is the "sound Machevill"--rather than Barabas, as Heywood's Prologue suggests (Minshull). By having Machiavel introduce Barabas, Marlowe encourages us from the outset to redouble the scapegoating of this already scapegoated Jew. Catherine Minshull points out that the term "Machiavellian" "could be used as an indiscriminate slogan to incite hatred of unpopular sections of society" (52). It should not surprise us that the supposedly Machiavellian Jew is expelled from society; the shock is that the apparently pious Governor who washes his hands of blood has learned Machiavelli's lessons in statecraft so well.[18] And, as several critics have suggested, Ferneze's methods bring to mind those of Elizabeth. Even if we attempt to scapegoat him as the "true" Machiavellian, we must recognize that the Maltese governor symbolically infiltrates the walls of the English *polis*.

iv.

Such is the function of the scapegoat: to shatter differences, escape retribution, and yet finally work the remedy of a sick society by separating inside from outside. In his deconstruction of the scapegoat-mechanism (that is, of the play of *differance* between the Greek cognates *pharmakos*, *pharmakon*, and *pharmakeus*) in Plato's *Pharmacy*, Jacques Derrida collects up the strands which we have woven through this chapter:

> The ceremony of the *pharmakos* is thus played out on the boundary line between inside and outside, which it has as its function ceaselessly to trace and retrace. *Intra muros*/ *extra muros*. The origin of difference and division, the *pharmakos* represents evil both introjected and projected.
>
> (*Dissemination* 133)

The most fearful aspect of Marlowe's Jew and of his Governor (as of the murderous Guise and the vengeful

Navarre), is that, although we recognize them as projections, they demand introjection. Luther hints at this demand when he urges readers of the Psalms to see Barabas and Christ as two aspects of their own personality: back-sliding Christians (especially apostate Catholics), "like the Jews . . . release the criminal Barabbas and kill the innocent Son of God, that is, the grace of God, which had just begun to take root in them" (42: 51). In traditional Christian terms, one must resist freeing the dangerous Barabas on the one hand and crucifying the purifying Christ on the other. Marlowe's play of scapegoating is infinitely more wide-ranging, but still his evocation of our mythically original, terrifying scene of persecution and projection carries an implicit challenge to trace and retrace the lines of our own complicity. As Girard argues, our tendency to rebuild structures that divide, to cut away the disturbing traces of commonality and separate the clean from the unclean, has inevitably triumphed in literary, as in anthropological studies ("Levi-Strauss").

In beginning the play of _differance_ in Marlowe's _Jew of Malta_, the deceptive dilations and dispersions of the scapegoating play, Machiavel almost gets lost himself in a "fatal labyrinth of misbelief."[19] But, pulled up sharply, he clarifies that he comes not "To read a lecture here in Britain, / But to present the tragedy of a Jew" (Prologue

29-30). The reminder is a necessary one, for Marlowe criticism too often ignores the dramatic, ambiguous essence of the text. Marlowe comes to bring not the peace of philosophy but "sweet violence," the sword of tragedy that separates and divides even as it attempts to unite. In "the tragedy of a Jew," Marlowe offers a parodic comment on the moral purpose of the genre as a whole. At the end of the play, as Barabas the actor jumps out of the "boiling cauldron" to claim his applause, the act of separation and retribution undoes itself again. Likewise, Marlowe the man, suffering an "untimely end" that might dehort the rebellious from "fellonious stratagems," escapes exile by re-membering himself on page and stage.

If Marlowe in history as in criticism has been venerated as well as cursed, put in the service of a multitude, so too has tragedy been thrown out of the Republic and, just as fervently, welcomed in again. Even as we dally in the pleasure of Marlowe's tragic texts, we see the seams of the system that keeps the material in place. And Marlowe reveals his own personal scapegoat throughout his oeuvre: the _de casibus_ model of tragedy, an ambivalent substance, acting both as medicine and poison, which plagues Marlowe as he struggles to contain and expel it. To speak of dalliance, dilation, and difference in Marlowe's tragedies is to acknowledge that his texts encourage the crossing of boundaries, the tracing and retracing of outside and inside. Through the interplay between scapegoat and system, Marlowe dares us (in his characteristic punning metaphor) to "raze the walls" and examine the rubble out of which all conventions--religious, political, even generic--are made, before we re-establish the familiar structures that keep Degree in place.

Notes

[1] All quotations from The Jew of Malta are taken from Van Fossen's edition in the Regents series.

[2] See Frye's treatment of the scapegoat or pharmakos in the Anatomy, where he explains that this "typical or random victim," found in ironic tragedy, "is neither innocent nor guilty" but rather "is in the situation of Job" (41-42). Rene Girard also offers a series of stimulating, if clearly polemical, studies on the scapegoat. The classic anthropological studies of the scapegoat are those by Frazer, in his Golden Bough (540 ff.); and Harrison. Linda Woodbridge in a valuable forthcoming book reanimates from an anthropological perspective the construct of the scapegoat as a key to understanding Shakespeare's plays: my discussion profits at several points from acquaintance with her manuscript. See also John Holloway's older study of Shakespearean tragedy, which uses the concept of the scapegoat more loosely.

[3] Gilbert points out that Castelvetro, like other Renaissance critics, "is misled by assuming a violent opposition between Plato and Aristotle" (349n101). For the notion of Aristotelian catharsis, especially in the Renaissance, see Herrick 19-67; Sparshott 14-37; and Spingarn 47-51.

[4] For Minshull, despite Machiavel's introduction of Barabas as his disciple, the play ultimately reveals the "sound Machiavel" to be Ferneze. Barabas appears more a caricature of the Elizabethan Machiavel, as understood through Gentillet's hostile translation which circulated widely in England.

[5] According to Harry Levin, Barabas speaks 49% of the lines in the play, a greater percentage than any other character in Marlowe's dramatic corpus (186).

[6] In his Great Code, Frye outlines not only Jesus' role as scapegoat, but also the process of separation and catharsis enacted in the scapegoat ritual. Just as the Jewish Day of Atonement ritual "consisted in separating a symbolic figure of a goat . . ., which represented their accumulated sin, from the community of Israel," so Christ's atoning sacrifice involves "the separation of Christ from the human community, an atonement that reunites God with man" (134). Frye also hints that the two animals specified in Levitical purification ceremonies as well as the Day of Atonement ritual re-emerge at Jesus' trial, with the crucified Christ on the one hand and the liberated Barabbas on the other (185). But, Frye clarifies, "It is . . . abundantly clear that Jesus has both roles," including that of the scapegoat who is symbolically released into the wilderness (185). Frye does, however, suggest the parodic possibilities of the scapegoat ritual: "The demonic parody

of such a rite would be an offering _to_ the demon, Azazel or whomever, which the scapegoat ritual perhaps originally was (see Leviticus 18:7)" (185-86). Marlowe's evocation of Barabbas as scapegoat shows traces of such a demonic parody. Given the historical connection that even medieval writers urged between the devil and the Jews, Christian Renaissance readings of Christ's trial might have emphasized Barabbas's demonic affinities, and the Jews' choice as a kind of satanic offering.

[7] Besides Hunter, Sanders (41-44) and Greenblatt (203-205) offer important discussions of the anti-semitic elements of the play. For Greenblatt, who compares Marlowe's _Jew of Malta_ to Marx's "On the Jewish Question," the former writer shows a focus on the "anarchic discharge of energy"; Barabas, like other Marlovian heroes, serves as a figure for the Elizabethan impulse to engage in restless, ambitious acquisition.

[8] Sims has shown that Marlowe's "use and abuse of Scripture" produces "the effect of a reversal in the order of things," and further suggests that both _The Jew of Malta_ and _Dr. Faustus_ involve a three-fold reversal of roles, values, and meaning (15-16). In "Biblical Parody," Deats finds that ironic biblical allusions in _The Jew_ supply a positive norm against which we may measure the limitations of Barabas and Maltese society. See Cornelius for a list of the play's biblical allusions (190-214).

[9] Most critics see Abigail, like Zenocrate, as a virtuous character in an evil and disordered society: see Cole 129-130; Deats, "Biblical Parody" 40; Harry Levin, Overreacher 70; and Weil 38.

[10] On the inversion of the moral order in the play, see also Beecher.

[11] See Cole: "The patience of Job is the extreme opposite of the violence of Barabas, as are all the elements of Job's character" (124). Hunter more extensively treats Marlowe's parody of Job through Barabas ("Theology" 218-21).

[12] James Smith describes the Drury Lane production of 1818, based on a revision of Marlowe's play by Samson Penley: "On the strength of the opening acts, he [Kean] played all out for tragedy, the tragedy of a noble alien monstrously wronged and magnificently revenged, who falls victim to 'the united mistakes of persecution from without, and selfish subtlety from within'" (10). This straightforward vision of scapegoat elements in Marlowe's work, as Smith points out, effaces "the play's multiplicity of tonal contrasts" (10).

[13] See James Smith 11 ff.

[14] Judging from differences in style and tone between the poetic story of the Book of Job and its prose prologue and epilogue, Job's comic restoration appears to have been added later by a disgruntled scribe who could not bear the

lack of poetic justice in the tale of one who is righteous *without* reward (Anderson 549-50).

[15] On Barabas's Antichrist features, see Hunter 65, 92, and *passim*; Deats, "Biblical Parody" 31-36.

[16] All quotations from *The Massacre at Paris* refer to the Methuen edition by H. S. Bennett.

[17] As Frye states in his discussion of demonic imagery in the *Anatomy*, the tyrant and scapegoat archetype merge into the same character in "the most concentrated form of the demonic parody" (148). I would argue that Marlowe's Guise represents this junction of "the tyrant-leader, inscrutable, ruthless, melancholy, and with an insatiable will" and "the *pharmakos* or sacrificed victim, who has to be killed to strengthen the others" (148).

[18] For the standard studies on Machiavelli and the Renaissance, see Meyer and Praz.

[19] See Freer's related argument that Machiavel fits into the play's "comprehensive theory of lying" (143).

Works Cited

Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 5th ed. New York: Holt, 1985.

Adamson, Jane. "Marlowe, Hero and Leander, and the Art of Leaping in Poetry." Critical Review 17 (1974): 59-81.

Agrippa, Henry Cornelius. Of the Vanitie and Vncertaintie of Artes and Sciences. Ed. Catherine M. Dunn. Northridge, CA: California State U, 1974.

Alexander, Nigel, ed. Introduction. Elizabethan Narrative Verse. London: Edward Arnold, 1967. 1-26.

Allen, Don Cameron. "Renaissance Remedies for Fortune: Marlowe and the Fortunati." Studies in Philology 38 (1941): 188-97.

Altman, Joel B. The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.

Anderson, Bernhard W. Understanding the Old Testament. 1957. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1975.

Apollodorus. "Epitome." Vol. 2 of The Library. Trans. Sir James George Frazer. 2 vols. London: Heinemann; New York: Putnam's, 1921.

Ardolino, Frank. "The Bearing of Deadly Letters: 'Uriah's Letter' in Marlowe, Kyd, and Shakespeare." Journal of Evolutionary Psychology 6.4 (Aug. 1985): 292-301.

Armstrong, William A., ed. Elizabethan History Plays. London: Oxford UP, 1965.

Ashton, J. W. "The Fall of Icarus." In Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hardin Craig. Ed. Baldwin Maxwell, et al. Stanford U, CA: Stanford UP, n.d. 153-59.

Baines, Barbara. "Sexual Polarity in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe." Ball State University Forum 23.3 (1982): 3-17.

Bakeless, John. The Tragicall History of Christopher Marlowe. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1942.

Bakhtin, M. M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

---. Rabelais and His World. Trans. Helen Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

Bale, John. King John. London, 1561. Repr. in Armstrong.

Barber, C. L. Creating Elizabethan Tragedy: The Theater of Marlowe and Kyd. Ed. Richard P. Wheeler. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Barthes, Roland. The Pleasure of the Text. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill & Wang, 1975.

---. S/Z: An Essay. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill & Wang, 1974. Orig. publ. in French 1970.

Battenhouse, Roy W. Marlowe's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1941.

Beard, Thomas. "Of Epicures and Atheists." The Theatre of

Gods Iudgments. London, 1597.

Beecher, Don. "The Jew of Malta and the Ritual of the Inverted Moral Order." CahiersE 12 (1977): 45-58.

Berek, Peter. "Tamburlaine's Weak Sons: Imitation as Interpretation before 1593." Renaissance Drama 13 (1982): 55-82.

Bevington, David. From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962.

Bevington, James, and James Shapiro. "'What are kings, when regiment is gone?'": The Decay of Ceremony in Edward II." Friedenreich, Poet 263-78.

Bieman, Elizabeth. "Comic Rhyme in Marlowe's Hero and Leander." English Literary Renaissance 9 (1979): 69-77.

Birringer, Johannes H. "Between Body and Language: 'Writing' the Damnation of Faust." Theatre Journal 36 (1984): 335-55.

---. "Marlowe's Violent Stage: 'Mirrors' of Honor in Tamburlaine." English Literary History 51 (1984): 219- 39.

Blackburn, William. "'Heavenly Words': Marlowe's Faustus as a Renaissance Magician." English Studies in Canada 4.1 (Spring 1978): 1-14.

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

---. "The Breaking of Form." In Deconstruction and Criticism. New York: Continuum, 1985. 1-37.

Boas, Frederick S. Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.

---. Marlowe and His Circle: A Biographical Survey. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1931.

Bowers, Fredson, ed. The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe. 2 vols. New York: Cambridge UP, 1973.

Bradbrook, M. C. Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1964.

Braden, Gordon. The Classics and English Renaissance Poetry: Three Case Studies. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.

Briggs, Julia. "Marlowe's Massacre at Paris: A Reconsideration." Review of English Studies 34 (1983): 257-78.

Bristol, Michael D. Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England. London: Methuen, 1985.

Brooke, C. F. Tucker. The Life of Marlowe. The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe. Vol. 1. Ed. R. H. Case. London: Methuen, 1930.

---. "The Marlowe Canon." PMLA 37 (1922): 367-417.

---, ed. The Works of Christopher Marlowe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Brooke, Nicholas. "Marlowe as a Provocative Agent in Shakespeare's Early Plays." Shakespeare Survey 14

(1961): 34-44.

---. "The Moral Tragedy of Doctor Faustus." Cambridge Journal 5.2 (1951-52): 662-87.

Brown, J. Howard. Elizabethan Schooldays: An Account of the English Grammar Schools in the Second Half of the Sixteeenth Century. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1933.

Budra, Paul. "The Mirror for Magistrates and the Shape of De Casibus Tragedy." English Studies (1988): 303-12.

Buland, Mable. The Presentation of Time in the Elizabethan Drama. New York: Haskell, 1966.

Bullen, A. H., ed. The Works of Christopher Marlowe. 3 vols. London: John C. Nimmo, 1885.

Bullinger, Henry. The Decades of Henry Bullinger. Trans. H. I. The Third Decade, Sixth Sermon. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1850. 167-217.

Bush, Douglas. Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry. New York: Norton, 1963.

Bushnell, Rebecca W. Tragedies of Tyrants; Political Thought and Theater in the English Renaissance. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

Campbell, Lily B. Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes: Slaves of Passion. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1930.

---. Tudor Conceptions of History and Tragedy in "A Mirror for Magistrates." Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1936.

Cantelupe, Eugene B. "Hero and Leander, Marlowe's

Tragicomedy of Love." *College English* 24 (1963): 295-298.

Cartelli, Thomas. "Endless Play: The False Starts of Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*." Friedenreich, *Poet* 117-28.

Cave, Terence. *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Charlton, H. B., and R. D. Waller, eds. *Edward II*. By Christopher Marlowe. 1933. Rev. F. N. Lees. London: Methuen, 1955.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Ed. F. N. Robinson. Boston: Houghton, 1957.

Chew, Samuel C. "The Allegorical Chariot in English Literature of the Renaissance." *De Artibus Opuscula XL: Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*. Ed. Millard Meiss. New York: New York UP, 1961. I: 37-54.

Cockcroft, Robert. "Emblematic Irony: Some Possible Significances of Tamburlaine's Chariot." *Renaissance and Modern Studies* 12 (1968): 33-55.

Cole, Douglas. *Suffering and Evil in the Plays of Christopher Marlowe*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.

Coleman, Dorothy Gabe. *Montaigne's Essais*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

Colie, Rosalie L. *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*. Ed. Barbara K. Lewalski. Berkeley: U of California P, 1973.

Collins, S. Ann. "Sundrie Shapes, Committing Headdie

Ryots, Incest, Rapes: Functions of Myth in Determining Narrative and Tone in Marlowe's Hero and Leander." Mosaic 4 (1970-71): 107-122.

Cope, Jackson I. "Marlowe's Dido and the Titillating Children." Dramaturgy of the Daemonic: Studies in Antigeneric Theater from Ruzante to Grimaldi. Ed. Jackson Cope. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1984.

Cornelius, R. M. Christopher Marlowe's Use of the Bible. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

Craig, Hardin. "The Shackling of Accidents." PQ 19 (Jan. 1940): 1-19.

Cubeta, Paul M. "Marlowe's Poet in Hero and Leander." College English 26 (1965): 500-505.

Culler, Jonathan. On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism After Structuralism. Ithaca: Cornell, 1982.

---. Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature. London and Henley: Routledge, 1975.

Cunningham, Karen Jean. The Spectacle of the Self: Language and Embodiment in Marlowe. Diss. University of California, Santa Barbara, 1985. Ann Arbor: UMI, n.d. 8613557.

Danson, Lawrence. "Christopher Marlowe: The Questioner." ELR 12 (1982): 3-29.

Deats, Sara Munson. "Biblical Parody in Marlowe's The Jew of Malta: A Re-Examination." Christianity and

Literature 37.2 (Winter 1988): 27-48.

---. "The Dialectic of Gender in Four of Marlowe's Plays." University of Hartford Studies in Literature 2.1 (1988): 13-35.

---. "Marlowe's Fearful Symmetry in Edward II." Friedenreich, Poet 241-61.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." Trans. Avital Ronell. Critical Inquiry (1980): 55-81.

---. "Plato's Pharmacy." Dissemination. Trans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981. 61-171.

De Serres, Jean. Trans. Thomas Tymme. The Fourth Parte of Commentaries of the Ciuill Warres of Fraunce. London, 1576.

---. The Three Partes of Commentaries of the Ciuill Warres of Fraunce. Trans. Thomas Tymme. London, 1574.

Dollimore, Jonathan. Radical Tragedy. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984.

Donno, Elizabeth Story. "The Epyllion." English Poetry and Prose, 1540-1674. Ed. Christopher Ricks. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1970. 82-100.

Doran, Madeleine. Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1959.

Driver, Tom F. "The Shakespearian Clock: Time and the Vision of Reality in Romeo and Juliet and The Tempest." Shakespeare Quarterly 15 (1964): 363-370.

Duane, Carol Leventen. "Marlowe's Mixed Messages: A Model for Shakespeare?" Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England 3 (1986): 51-67.

Dubrow, Heather. Genre. The Critical Idiom. London and New York: Methuen, 1982.

Duffy, Brian Joseph. The English Language and English Literary Genres in Transition 1475-1600. New York and London: Garland, 1987.

Eccles, Mark. Christopher Marlowe in London. Harvard Studies in English 10. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1934.

Eliot, T. S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent" and "Christopher Marlowe." Selected Essays 1917-1932. London: Faber, 1932. 13-22 and 118-25.

Ellis-Fermor, Una. Christopher Marlowe. 1927. Hamden, CN: Archon, 1967.

Fanta, Christopher G. Marlowe's "Agonists": An Approach to the Ambiguity of His Plays. The LeBaron Russell Briggs Prize, Honors Essays in English. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1970.

Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. 1936. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.

Fehrenbach, Robert J., et al. A Concordance to the Plays, Poems, and Translations of Christopher Marlowe. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1982.

Fitz, L. T. "Humanism Questioned: A Study of Four Renaissance Characters." English Studies in Canada

5.4 (Winter 1979): 388-405.

Fitzgerald, Robert, trans. The Aeneid. By Virgil. New York: Vintage, 1984.

Florio, John. Preface. The Essays on Morall, Politike, and Millitarie Discourses of Lo. Michaell de Montaigne. Trans. John Florio. 1603. Repr. Essays. By Montaigne. London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1910. 3 vols. I:1-14.

Fortescue, Thomas. The Foreste. London, 1571.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is An Author?" Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews. Ed. Donald Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977. 113-39.

Fowler, Alastair. Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1982.

Fraser, Russell A. "The Art of Hero and Leander." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 57 (1958): 743-754.

Fraunce, Abraham. The Third Part of the Countesse of Pembrokes Yuychurch. Entitled Amintas Dale (1592). Ed. Gerald Snare. Northridge, CA: California State U, 1975.

Frazer, J. G. The Golden Bough. New York: Phillips, 1959.

Freer, Coburn. "Lies and Lying in The Jew of Malta." Friedenreich, Poet 143-65.

Fricker, Robert H. "The Dramatic Structure of Edward II." English Studies 34 (1953): 203-17.

Friedenreich, Kenneth. *Christopher Marlowe: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism Since 1950*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1979.

---, et. al., eds. *"A Poet and a filthy Play-maker": New Essays on Christopher Marlowe*. New York: AMS, 1988.

---. "Marlowe's Endings." Friedenreich, *Poet* 361-68.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

---. *Fools of Time: Studies in Shakespearean Tragedy*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967.

---. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. Toronto: Academic, 1981.

---. "The Rhythms of Time." *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays, 1974, 1988*. Ed. Robert D. Denham. Charlottesville and London: UP of Virginia, 1990. 157- 67.

---. "The Tragedies of Nature and Fortune." *Stratford Papers on Shakespeare* (1961). Ed. B. W. Jackson. 38-55.

---. *Words With Power: Being a Second Study of the Bible and Literature*. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Viking Penguin, 1990.

Garber, Marjorie. "'Here's Nothing Writ': Scribe, Script, and Circumspection in Marlowe's Plays." *Theatre Journal* 36 (1984): 301-20.

Gascoigne, George, and Francis Kinwelmershe. *Jocasta*.

London, 1566.

Gelzer, Thomas. Introduction. Hero and Leander. By Musaeus. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP; London: Heinemann, 1975. 297-343.

Gibbons, Brian. "'Unstable Proteus': The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage." Morris, Christopher Marlowe 25-46.

Gill, Roma, ed. The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

---. "Marlowe, Lucan, and Sulpitius." Review of English Studies n.s. 24 (1973): 401-13.

---. "Marlowe's Virgil: Dido Queene of Carthage." Review of English Studies 28 (1977): n.s. 142-55.

-----. "Snakes Leape by Verse." Morris, Christopher Marlowe 135-50.

Girard, Rene. "Levi-Strauss, Frye, Derrida and Shakespearean Criticism." Diacritics 3 (1973): 34-38.

---. The Scapegoat. Trans. Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.

---. "'To Entrap the Wisest': A Reading of The Merchant of Venice." Literature and Society (Selected Papers from the English Institute). Ed. Edward W. Said. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. 100-119.

Godshalk, W. L. "Hero and Leander: The Sense of an Ending." Friedenreich, Poet 293-314.

---. The Marlovian World Picture. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

---. "Marlowe and Lucan." Notes and Queries NS 18 (1971): 13.

Golding, Arthur, trans. Ovid's Metamorphoses (1567). Ed. John Frederick Nims. London: Macmillan, 1965.

Gordon, D. J. "Chapman's 'Hero and Leander.'" English Miscellany 5 (1954): 41-91. Ed. Mario Praz.

Graves, Robert. The Greek Myths. 2 vols. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980.

Greenblatt, Stephen. Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Greene, Robert. Alphonsus, King of Aragon. London, 1587.

Greg, W. W. Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, 1604-1616. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1950.

Guy-Bray, Stephen. "Homophobia and the Depoliticizing of Edward II." English Studies in Canada 27.2 (June 1991): 125-33.

Hamilton, A. C. Northrop Frye: Anatomy of His Criticism. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1990.

Hardin, Richard F. "Marlowe and the Fruits of Scholarism." Philological Quarterly 63.3 (1984): 387-400.

Harrison, J. E. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. New York: Meridian, 1903.

Hart, Jonathan. "Temporality and Theatricality in

Shakespeare's Lancastrian Tetralogy." Studia Neophilologica 63 (1991): 69-88.

---. Theater and World: The Problematics of Shakespeare's History. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1991.

Heilman, Robert B. "The Tragedy of Knowledge: Marlowe's Treatment of Faustus." Quarterly Review of Literature 2 (1945-46): 316-32.

Heller, Monica, ed. Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1988.

Hernadi, Paul. Beyond Genre: New Directions in Literary Classification. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972.

Herrick, Marvin Theodore. The Poetics of Aristotle in England. New Haven: Yale UP, 1930.

Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan (1651). Ed. C. B. MacPherson. 1968. Markham, ON: Penguin, 1985.

Holloway, John. The Story of the Night: Studies in Shakespeare's Major Tragedies. London: Routledge, 1961.

Hunter, G. K. "Henry IV and the Elizabethan Two-Part Play." Review of English Studies n.s. 5 (1954): 236-48.

---. "The Theology of Marlowe's The Jew of Malta." Dramatic Identities and Cultural Tradition: Studies in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries. Edinburgh: Liverpool UP, 1978.

Innes, Mary M., trans. The Metamorphoses of Ovid. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1955.

Jardine, Lisa. "Humanism and the Sixteenth Century Arts Course." History of Education 4.1 (1975): 16-31.

---. "The Place of Dialectic Teaching in Sixteenth-Century Cambridge." Studies in the Renaissance 21 (1974): 31-62.

Jonson, Ben. Works. Ed. C. H. Herford Percy and Evelyn Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1938.

Jorgensen, Paul A. Redeeming Shakespeare's Words. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1962. 52-69.

Joseph, Sister Miriam. Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language. New York: Columbia UP, 1947.

Jump, John D., ed. The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus. By Christopher Marlowe. Revels Plays. London: Methuen, 1968.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

Kastan, David Scott. Shakespeare and the Shapes of Time. Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1982.

---. "The Shape of Time: Form and Value in the Shakespearean History Play." Comparative Drama 7 (1973-74): 259-77.

Keach, William. Elizabethan Erotic Narratives: Irony and Pathos in the Ovidian Poetry of Shakespeare, Marlowe, and Their Contemporaries. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1977.

-----. "Marlowe's Hero as 'Venus' Nun.'" English Literary Renaissance 2 (1972): 298-320.

Kearney, Hugh. Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Pre-Industrial Britain 1500-1700. London: Faber, 1970.

Keefer, Michael H. "Misreading Faustus Misreading: The Question of Context." DR 65 (1985-86): 511-33.

Kelly, Henry. Divine Providence in the England of Shakespeare's Histories. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1970.

Kermode, Frank. The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction. New York: Oxford UP, 1967.

Kerrigan, William. "The Articulation of the Ego in the English Renaissance." The Literary Freud: Mechanisms of Defense and the Poetic Will. Ed. Joseph H. Smith. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1980. 261-308.

Kiefer, Frederick. Fortune and Elizabethan Tragedy. N.p.: Huntington Library, 1983.

Kimbrough, Robert. Sir Philip Sindey: Selected Prose and Poetry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1983.

Kirschbaum, Leo. "Dr. Faustus: A Reconsideration." Review of English Studies 19 (1943): 225-41.

Knoll, Robert E. "The Narrator in Hero and Leander." Christopher Marlowe. Twayne's English Author Series 74. New York: Twayne, 1969. 127-139.

Kocher, Paul H. Christopher Marlowe: A Study of His Thought, Learning, and Character. 1946. New York: Russell, 1962.

---. "Contemporary Pamphlet Backgrounds for Marlowe's Massacre at Paris." Modern Language Quarterly 8 (1947): 151-73; 309-18.

---. "Francois Hotman and Marlowe's The Massacre at Paris." PMLA 56 (1941): 349-68.

Kott, Jan. The Bottom Translation: Marlowe and Shakespeare and the Carnival Tradition. Trans. Daniela Miedzyrzecka and Lillian Vallee. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1987.

Kuriyama, Constance Brown. Hammer or Anvil: Psychological Patterns in Christopher Marlowe's Plays. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1980.

---. "Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the Nature of Biographical Evidence." University of Hartford Studies in Literature 20.1 (1988): 1-11.

---. "Marlowe's Nemesis: The Identity of Richard Baines." Friedenreich, Poet 343-59.

Lalka, David G. Christopher Marlowe: Some Studies in Genre. Diss. U of South Carolina, 1976. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1989. 77-6769.

Leech, Clifford. Christopher Marlowe: Poet for the Stage. Ed. Anne Lancashire. 1986.

---. "The Structure of Tamburlaine." Tulane Drama Review

8.4 (1964): 32-64.

Levin, Harry. The Overreacher: A Study of Christopher Marlowe. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1952.

Levin, Richard. "The Contemporary Perception of Marlowe's Tamburlaine." Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England 1 (1984): 51-70.

Lewis, C. S. "Hero and Leander." Proceedings of the British Academy 28 (1952): 23-37. Rpt. in Elizabethan Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism. Ed. Paul J. Alpers. New York: Oxford UP, 1967. 235-250.

Logan, Robert A. "Perspective in Marlowe's Hero and Leander: Engaging Our Detachment." Friedenreich, Poet 279-291.

Lucian. Charidemus. Vol. 8 of Works. Trans. M. D. MacLeod. 8 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP; London: Heinemann, 1967.

Luther, Martin. Works. Ed. Jaroslave Pelikan. Volume 14 Selected Psalms III). Saint Louis: Concordia, 1958.

MacLean, Hugh. "Time and Horsemanship in Shakespeare's Histories." University of Toronto Quarterly 35 (1966): 229-45.

Maclure, Millar, ed. The Poems: Christopher Marlowe. Revels Edition of the Works of Christopher Marlowe. Clifford Leech, gen. ed. London: Methuen, 1968.

Mahood, M. M. Poetry and Humanism. 1950. New York: Gordian, 1966.

Margeson, J. M. R. The Origins of English Tragedy. Oxford; Clarendon, 1967.

Marlowe, Christopher. All Ovids Elegies and Lucans First Booke. Gill, Complete Works 13-111.

---. Edward II. Ed. H. B. Charlton and R. D. Waller. 1933. Rev. F. N. Lees. London: Methuen, 1955.

---. Hero and Leander. Gill, Complete Works 177-209.

---. The Jew of Malta. Ed. Richard W. Van Fossen. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1964.

---. The Massacre at Paris. Ed. H. S. Bennett (with The Jew of Malta). The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe. General ed. R. H. Case. London: Methuen, 1931. 169-255.

---. Tamburlaine the Great, Parts I and II. Ed. John D. Jump. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln and London: U of Nebraska P, 1967.

---. The Tragedie of Dido Queen of Carthage. In Gill 125-74.

---. The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus. Ed. John D. Jump. The Revels Plays. London: Methuen, 1968.

Martin, Richard. "Marlowe's Tamburlaine and the Language of Romance." PMLA 93 (1978): 248-64.

Martz, Louis L., ed. Hero and Leander by Christopher Marlowe: A Facsimile of the First Edition, London,

1958. Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library; New York: Johnson Rpt, 1972.

Masinton, Charles G. Christopher Marlowe's Tragic Vision: A Study in Damnation. Athens, OH: Ohio UP, 1972.

McAlindon, Thomas. English Renaissance Tragedy. Vancouver: U of British Columbia, 1986. 82-134.

---. "Tamburlaine the Great and The Spanish Tragedy: The Genesis of a Tradition." Huntington Library Quarterly 45 (1982): 59-81.

McCloskey, Susan. "The Worlds of Edward II." Renaissance Drama" 167 (1985): 35-48.

McKenzie, D. F. Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts. The Panizzi Lectures. London: British Library, 1985.

Meyer, Edward. Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama. Weimar, 1897.

Miller, Paul W. "A Function of Myth in Marlowe's 'Hero and Leander.'" Studies in Philology 50 (1953): 158-167.

Milton, John. Complete Poems and Major Prose. Ed. Merritt Y. Hughes. Indianapolis: Odyssey, 1957.

Minshull, Catherine. "Marlowe's 'Sound Machevill.'" Renaissance Drama 13 (1982): 35-53.

The Mirror for Magistrates. 1559-87. Ed. Lily B. Campbell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. Essays. Trans. John Florio (1603). 3 vols. London: Dent, 1946.

Montgomery, Robert. "The Dimensions of Time in Richard

II." *Shakespeare Studies* 4 (1968): 73-85.

Morris, Brian. "Comic Method in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*." Morris, *Christopher Marlowe* 115-131.

---, ed. *Christopher Marlowe*. Mermaid Critical Commentaries. New York: Hill & Wang, 1968.

Mulryne, J. R., and Stephen Fender. "Marlowe and the 'Comic Distance.'" Morris, *Christopher Marlowe* 49-64.

Musaeus. *Hero and Leander*. Trans. Cedric Whitman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP; London: William Heinemann, 1975. 291-389.

Nelson, Timothy G. A. "Marlowe and His Audience: A Study of *Tamburlaine*." *Southern Review: An Australian Journal of Literary Studies* 3 (1969): 249-632.

Nicoll, Allardyce. "'Tragical-comical-historical-pastoral': Elizabethan Dramatic Nomenclature." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 43 (1960): 70-87.

Ong, Walter J., S. J. *Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1971.

Ovid. *Heroides and Amores*. Trans. Grant Showerman. London: William Heinemann; New York: MacMillan, 1914.

Palmer, D. J. "Marlowe's Naturalism." In Morris, ed. 151-76.

Panofsky, Erwin. *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York and Evanston:

Harper, 1962.

Parker, Patricia. "Dilation and Delay: Renaissance Matrices." *Poetics Today* 5.3 (1984): 519-535.

---. *Inescapable Romance: Studies in the Poetics of a Mode*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979.

---. "Literary Fat Ladies and the Generation of the Text." *Literary Fat Ladies: Rhetoric, Gender, Property*. London: Methuen, 1987. 8-35.

Patch, Howard. *The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature*. 1927. New York: Octagon, 1967.

Pendry, E. D., and J. C. Maxwell, eds. *Christopher Marlowe Complete Plays and Poems*. London: Dent; Totowa, NJ: Rowman, 1976.

Peterson, Douglas L. *Time, Tide, and Tempest: A Study of Shakespeare's Romances*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1973.

Pindar. *The Odes of Pindar Including the Principal Fragments*. Trans. John Sandys. Cambridge: Harvard UP; London: Heinemann, 1961. First pub. 1915.

Powell, Jocelyn. "Marlowe's Spectacle." *Tulane Drama Review* 8 (1964): 195-210.

Praz, Mario. *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans*. Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy, 1928.

Prince, Gerald. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. 1987. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie*. 1589. Ed.

Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1936.

Quinones, Ricardo J. *The Renaissance Discovery of Time*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1972.

Ribner, Irving, ed. *The Complete Plays of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Odyssey, 1963.

---. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957.

---. "Marlowe's *Edward II* and the Tudor History Play." In *Shakespeare's Contemporaries: Modern Studies in English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. Max Bluestone and Norman Rabkin. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970. 161-72.

---. "Marlowe's 'Tragicke Glass.'" In *Essays on Shakespeare and Elizabethan Drama in Honor of Hardin Craig*. Ed. Richard Hosley. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1962. 91-114.

Richmond, Velma Bourgeois. "Renaissance Sexuality and Marlowe's Women." *Ball State University Forum* 16.4 (1975): 36-44.

Rossiter, A. P. *Angel with Horns and Other Shakespeare Lectures*. Ed. Graham Storey. New York: Theatre Arts, 1961.

Rozett, Martha Tuck. *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.

Sanders, Wilbur. The Dramatist and the Received Idea: Studies in the Plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 1968.

Seaton, Ethel. "Marlowe's Light Reading." In Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies Presented to F. P. Wilson in Honor of His Seventieth Birthday. Ed. Herbert Davis and Helen Gardner. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960. 17-35.

Shakespeare, William. The Riverside Shakespeare. General ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton, 1974.

Shapiro, James. "'Metre meete to furnish Lucans style': Reconsidering Marlowe's Lucan." Friedenreich, Poet 315- 25.

Sheidley, William E. "The Seduction of the Reader in Marlowe's Hero and Leander," Concerning Poetry 3 (1970): 50-56.

Sidney, Sir Philip. A Defence of Poetry. Ed. J. A. Van Dorsten. 1966. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.

Sims, James H. Dramatic Uses of Biblical Allusions in Marlowe and Shakespeare. University of Florida Monographs (Humanities) 24. Gainesville: U of Florida P, 1966.

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968.

Smith, Hallett. Elizabethan Poetry: A Study in Conventions, Meaning, and Expression. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1952.

---. "Tamburlaine and the Renaissance." Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds. University of Colorado Studies 2.4 (1945). 126-31.

Smith, James L. "The Jew of Malta in the Theatre." Morris, Christopher Marlowe 3-23.

Sparshott, Francis. "The Riddle of Katharsis." In Centre and Labyrinth: Essays in Honour of Northrop Frye. Ed. Eleanor Cook, et al. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1983. 14-37.

Spence, Leslie. "Tamburlaine and Marlowe." PMLA 42 (1927): 604-22.

Spencer, Theodore. Death and Elizabethan Tragedy. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1936.

Spingarn, J. E. A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance. 1899. New York: Harcourt, 1963.

Steane, J. B. Marlowe: A Critical Study. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 1964.

Stilling, Roger. Love and Death in Renaissance Tragedy. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1976.

Stockholder, Kay. "'Within the massy entrailes of the earth': Faustus's Relation to Women." Friedenreich. Poet 203-19.

Summers, Claude J. "Sex, Politics, and Self-Realization in Edward II." Friedenreich, Poet 221-40.

Taylor, Anthony Brian. "Marlowe and The Mirror for

Magistrates." Notes and Queries 33. 231. 3 (Sept. 1986): 336-67.

Thompson, Craig R. Schools in Tudor England. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1958.

Thurn, David H. "Sights of Power in Tamburlaine." English Literary Renaissance 19 (1989): 3-21.

Tillyard, E. M. W. Shakespeare's History Plays. London: Chatto & Windus, 1944.

Traister, Barbara Howard. Heavenly Necromancers: The Magician in English Renaissance Drama. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1984.

Tucker Brooke, C. F., ed. The Works of Christopher Marlowe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.

Turner, Myron. "Pastoral and Hermaphrodite: A Study in the Naturalism of Marlowe's Hero and Leander." Texas Studies in Literature and Language 17 (1975-76): 397-414.

Virgil. The Aeneid. Trans. Robert Fitzgerald. New York: Vintage, 1984.

Waith, Eugene M. "Edward II: The Shadow of Action." Tulane Drama Review 8.4 (1964): 59-76.

---. The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare and Dryden. London: Chatto & Windus, 1962.

Weil, Judith. Christopher Marlowe: Merlin's Prophet. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 1977.

Wheeler, Richard P. Introduction. Creating Elizabethan

Tragedy: The Theater of Marlowe and Kyd. By C. L. Barber. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1988. 1-44.

Whetstone, George. *The English Myrror*. London, 1586.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980-81): 5-27.

Williams, Martin. "The Temptations in Marlowe's *Hero and Leander*." *Modern Language Quarterly* 16 (1955): 229-230.

Wilson, F. P. *Marlowe and the Early Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.

Wise, Jennifer. "Marginalizing Drama: Bakhtin's Theory of Genre." *Essays in Theatre* 8.1 (1989): 15-22.

Zocca, Louis R. *Elizabethan Narrative Poetry*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1950.